

Mean-field limit and Semiclassical Expansion of a Quantum Particle System

Federica Pezzotti¹, Mario Pulvirenti²

Abstract

We consider a quantum system constituted by N identical particles interacting by means of a mean-field Hamiltonian. It is well known that, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the one-particle state obeys to the Hartree equation. Moreover, propagation of chaos holds. In this paper, we take care of the $\hbar$ dependence by considering the semiclassical expansion of the N -particle system. We prove that each term of the expansion agrees, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, with the corresponding one associated with the Hartree equation. We work in the classical phase space by using the Wigner formalism, which seems to be the most appropriate for the present problem.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The Hartree dynamics	5
3. The N -particle dynamics	7
4. Hierarchies	9
5. The classical mean-field limit	12
6. Results and technical preliminaries	16
7. Convergence	19
Appendix A	30
Appendix B	34
Appendix C	39
References	44

1. INTRODUCTION

The Hartree equation is the following nonlinear one-particle Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar\partial_t\psi = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\Delta\psi + (\phi * |\psi|^2)\psi, \quad (1.1)$$

where the mass of the particle is chosen equal to one, $\phi : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the two-body potential and

$$(\phi * |\psi|^2)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dy \phi(x-y) |\psi(y)|^2 \quad (1.2)$$

¹Dipartimento di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, Università dell'Aquila, Italy -
e-mail: federica.pezzotti@univaq.it

²Dipartimento di Matematica "G. Castelnuovo", Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Italy -
e-mail: pulvirenti@mat.uniroma1.it

is the effective self-consistent interaction.

Equation (1.1) arises as the reduced description of a system of N identical particles interacting by means of the mean-field potential:

$$U_N(X_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq l < j \leq N}^N \phi(x_l - x_j), \quad (1.3)$$

(where $X_N = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $j = 1, \dots, N$) in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

In fact, consider the N -particle wave function $\Psi_N = \Psi_N(X_N; t)$ solution of the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar \partial_t \Psi_N = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{x_i} \Psi_N + U_N \Psi_N, \quad (1.4)$$

with a completely factorized initial state given by:

$$\Psi_N(X_N; 0) = \Psi_{N,0}(X_N) = \prod_{j=1}^N \psi_0(x_j). \quad (1.5)$$

Then, it is well known that the j -particle reduced density matrices, defined as:

$$\rho_j^N(X_j, Y_j; t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)}} dX_{N-j} \Psi_N(X_j, X_{N-j}; t) \overline{\Psi}_N(Y_j, X_{N-j}; t), \quad (1.6)$$

converges, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ and for any fixed $j = 1, \dots, N$, to the factorized state:

$$\rho_j(X_j, Y_j; t) = \prod_{k=1}^j \psi(x_k; t) \overline{\psi}(y_k; t), \quad (1.7)$$

where $\psi(x; t)$ solves the one-particle Hartree equation (1.1) with initial datum ψ_0 . This feature is usually called "propagation of chaos".

The previous result was originally obtained for sufficiently smooth potentials (see [1], [2], [3]); then it has been generalized to include Coulomb interactions (see [4], [5], [6]). Furthermore, some results concerning the speed of convergence of the mean-field evolution to the Hartree dynamics (for all fixed times), have been proven more recently (see [7], [8]).

The limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ for a classical system interacting by means of the same mean-field interaction (1.3), can be considered as well (see [9], [10], [11], [12], [13] for the case of smooth potential, and [14] for more singular interaction). In fact, considering as initial state of the system a probability measure $F_{N,0} = F_{N,0}(X_N, V_N)$ in the N -particle phase space which is completely factorized, namely:

$$F_{N,0}(X_N, V_N) = \prod_{j=1}^N f_0(x_j, v_j), \quad (1.8)$$

where f_0 is a given one-particle probability density, it is known that its evolution at time $t > 0$, denoted by $F_N(X_N, V_N; t)$, is obtained by solving the Liouville equation:

$$(\partial_t + V_N \cdot \nabla_{X_N}) F_N = \nabla_{X_N} U_N \cdot \nabla_{V_N} F_N. \quad (1.9)$$

Then, the j -particle distribution at time $t > 0$, defined as

$$f_j^N(X_j, V_j; t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)} \times \mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)}} dX_{N-j} dV_{N-j} F_N(X_j, V_j, X_{N-j}, V_{N-j}; t), \quad (1.10)$$

converges, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, to the product state:

$$f_j(X_j, V_j; t) = \prod_{k=1}^j f(x_k, v_k; t), \quad (1.11)$$

where $f(x, v; t)$ is the solution of the Vlasov equation:

$$(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f = (\nabla \phi * f) \cdot \nabla_v f, \quad (1.12)$$

(the convolution above is with respect to both the variables x and v) with initial datum f_0 . Equation (1.12) is the classical analogous of the Hartree equation (1.1).

Although the mean-field limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ is well understood for both classical and quantum systems, there is a question which seems to be still open, namely, does that limit hold for quantum systems uniformly in $\hbar$, at least for systems having a reasonable classical analogue? The proofs which are available up to now exhibit an error vanishing when $N \rightarrow \infty$ but diverging as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, although in [16], [17], [18], [19] some efforts in the direction of a better control of the error term have been done.

If one wants to deal with the classical and quantum case simultaneously, it is natural to work in the classical phase space by using the Wigner formalism.

The one-particle Wigner function associated with the wave function $\psi(x; t)$ is given by:

$$f^\hbar(x, v; t) = (2\pi)^{-3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dy e^{iy \cdot v} \overline{\psi}\left(x + \frac{\hbar y}{2}; t\right) \psi\left(x - \frac{\hbar y}{2}; t\right), \quad (1.13)$$

and, similarly, the N -particle Wigner function associated with the wave function $\Psi_N(X_N; t)$ is defined as:

$$W_N^\hbar(X_N, V_N; t) = (2\pi)^{-3N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} dY_N e^{iY_N \cdot V_N} \overline{\Psi}_N\left(X_N + \frac{\hbar Y_N}{2}; t\right) \Psi_N\left(X_N - \frac{\hbar Y_N}{2}; t\right). \quad (1.14)$$

Then, by using that $\psi(x; t)$ and $\Psi_N(X_N; t)$ solve equations (1.1) and (1.4) respectively, we find the equations:

$$(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f^\hbar = T^\hbar f^\hbar \quad (1.15)$$

and

$$(\partial_t + V_N \cdot \nabla_{X_N}) W_N^\hbar = T_N^\hbar W_N^\hbar, \quad (1.16)$$

where $T^\hbar$ and $T_N^\hbar$ are suitable pseudodifferential operators.

The initial data for equations (1.15) and (1.16) are

$$f_0^{\hbar}(x, v) = (2\pi)^{-3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dy \, e^{iy \cdot v} \overline{\psi}_0 \left(x + \frac{\hbar y}{2} \right) \psi_0 \left(x - \frac{\hbar y}{2} \right), \quad (1.17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} W_{N,0}^{\hbar}(X_N, V_N) &= (2\pi)^{-3N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} dY_N \, e^{iY_N \cdot V_N} \overline{\Psi}_{N,0} \left(X_N + \frac{\hbar Y_N}{2} \right) \Psi_{N,0} \left(X_N - \frac{\hbar Y_N}{2} \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^N f_0^{\hbar}(x_j, v_j), \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

respectively.

One can easily rephrase the result of [1] by showing that the j -particle Wigner function

$$W_{N,j}^{\hbar}(X_j, V_j; t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)} \times \mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)}} dX_{N-j} dV_{N-j} W_N^{\hbar}(X_j, X_{N-j}, V_j, V_{N-j}; t) \quad (1.19)$$

converges, in a suitable sense, to

$$f_j^{\hbar}(X_j, V_j; t) = \prod_{k=1}^j f^{\hbar}(x_k, v_k; t) \quad \text{for any } t > 0. \quad (1.20)$$

However, the convergence error is diverging when $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ (for example, for sufficiently small times $t < t_0$ it is of the form $\frac{C_j}{N} e^{\frac{C_j}{\hbar}}$). The reason is that the operators $T^{\hbar}$ and $T_N^{\hbar}$ appearing in (1.15) and (1.16) are bounded as operators acting on the space in which we can prove the convergence of (1.19), but their norm diverge as $\frac{C_j}{\hbar}$ when $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, the classical counterpart of this problem has been solved, so that it seems natural to look for an asymptotic expansion for the j -particle distributions $W_{N,j}^{\hbar}$, namely:

$$W_{N,j}^{\hbar}(t) = W_{N,j}^{(0)}(t) + \hbar W_{N,j}^{(1)}(t) + \hbar^2 W_{N,j}^{(2)}(t) + \dots, \quad (1.21)$$

and for an analogous expansion for the j -fold product of solutions of the equation (1.15), namely:

$$f_j^{\hbar}(t) = (f^{\hbar})^{\otimes j}(t) = f_j^{(0)}(t) + \hbar f_j^{(1)}(t) + \hbar^2 f_j^{(2)}(t) + \dots \quad (1.22)$$

The zero order term in (1.21) corresponds properly to what we previously denoted by f_j^N , while the function $f_j^{(0)}$ appearing in (1.22) is exactly the j -fold product of what we called f (see (1.10) and (1.12)). Therefore, at zero order in $\hbar$ we obtained the classical quantities, as expected, and we know that the convergence of $W_{N,j}^{(0)}$ to $f_j^{(0)}$ is well established. Then, it looks natural to try to show the convergence

$$W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow f_j^{(k)}(t), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for any } k > 0. \quad (1.23)$$

This is the goal of the present paper.

A complete proof of the uniformity in $\hbar$ of the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ would require a control of the remainder of the expansion (1.21), but we are not able to do this. However the error term of

order k in the expansion (1.22) can be proven to be $O(\hbar^{k+1})$ by adapting the proof in [15] for the linear case to the present context, under suitable smoothness assumptions.

The plan of the paper is the following. In the next two sections we present a semiclassical expansion of the Hartree equation and of the N -particle system. After a brief discussion of the hierarchical structures and their inadequacy as a technical tool for the present problem, we introduce the classical mean-field limit which is the basis of our analysis. After that, we explain the strategy of the proof of the convergence (1.23). The last two sections are devoted to the precise statement of our result, its proof and supplementary comments. Three Appendices contain technicalities.

2. THE HARTREE DYNAMICS

The Wigner-Liouville equation associated with the Hartree equation (1.1) reads as:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f^\varepsilon = T_{f^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon f^\varepsilon, \\ f^\varepsilon(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = f_0^\varepsilon(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where, from now on, we set $\varepsilon = \hbar$. Furthermore $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and $f^\varepsilon(x, v; t)$ is defined as in (1.13) and it is a real (but non necessarily positive) function on the classical phase space. We remark that in the previous section we used the notation $T^\varepsilon f^\varepsilon$ for the right hand side of (2.1) but now we use $T_{f^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon f^\varepsilon$ to stress the nonlinearity of equation (2.1).

Here T^ε acts as follows:

$$T_g^\varepsilon f^\varepsilon(x, v) = (2\pi)^{-3} i \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} d\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dk \hat{\phi}(k) \hat{\rho}_g(k) e^{i k \cdot x} (k \cdot \nabla_v) f^\varepsilon(x, v + \varepsilon \lambda k), \quad (2.2)$$

where, as usual, $\phi = \phi(x)$ denotes the two-body interaction potential and

$$\rho_g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dv g(x, v). \quad (2.3)$$

Finally, we denoted by $\hat{\rho}_g$ and $\hat{\phi}$ the Fourier transforms of ρ_g and ϕ respectively, namely:

$$\hat{\rho}_g(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dx e^{-i k \cdot x} \rho_g(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\phi}(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dx e^{-i k \cdot x} \phi(x). \quad (2.4)$$

Following [15], for a fixed g , T_g^ε can be expanded as

$$T_g^\varepsilon = T_g^{(0)} + \varepsilon T_g^{(1)} + \varepsilon^2 T_g^{(2)} + \dots \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$T_g^{(n)} = c_n (2\pi)^{-3} i \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dk \hat{\phi}(k) \hat{\rho}_g(k) e^{i k \cdot x} (k \cdot \nabla_v)^{n+1}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$c_n = \frac{1}{2^n (n+1)!}, \quad (2.7)$$

for n even and

$$T_g^{(n)} = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

for n odd. The operator $T_g^{(n)}$, for n even, can be also written as

$$T_g^{(n)} = (-1)^{n/2} c_n (D_x^{n+1} \phi * g) \cdot D_v^{n+1}, \quad (2.9)$$

where, as in (1.12), $*$ denotes the convolution with respect to both x and v and we used the notation:

$$D_x^n \nu \cdot D_v^n \zeta = \sum_{\substack{n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{N}: \\ \sum_j n_j = n}} \frac{\partial^n \nu}{\partial^{n_1} x^1 \partial^{n_2} x^2 \partial^{n_3} x^3} \frac{\partial^n \zeta}{\partial^{n_1} v^1 \partial^{n_2} v^2 \partial^{n_3} v^3}, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\text{with } x = (x^1, x^2, x^3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } v = (v^1, v^2, v^3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

for the one-particle functions ν and ζ .

We want to determine a semiclassical expansion of $f^\varepsilon(x, v; t)$, solution of equation (2.1), namely:

$$f^\varepsilon(t) = f^{(0)}(t) + \varepsilon f^{(1)}(t) + \varepsilon^2 f^{(2)}(t) + \dots \quad (2.11)$$

First of all, we observe that interesting physical states, such as coherent states (see e.g. the forthcoming Section 6), have a similar expansion even at time $t = 0$, namely:

$$f_0^\varepsilon = f_0^{(0)} + \varepsilon f_0^{(1)} + \varepsilon^2 f_0^{(2)} + \dots \quad (2.12)$$

Inserting (2.11) in (2.5) and setting:

$$T_k^{(n)} = T_{f^{(k)}}^{(n)}, \quad (2.13)$$

we readily arrive to the following sequence of problems for the coefficients $f^{(k)}(t)$ of the expansion (2.11):

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f^{(0)} = T_0^{(0)} f^{(0)}, \\ f^{(0)}(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = f_0^{(0)}(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f^{(k)} = L(f^{(0)}) f^{(k)} + \Theta^{(k)}, \\ f^{(k)}(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = f_0^{(k)}(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

for $k \geq 1$, where

$$L(h)f = T_h^{(0)} f + T_f^{(0)} h = (\nabla_x \phi * h) \cdot \nabla_v f + (\nabla_x \phi * f) \cdot \nabla_v h, \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$\Theta^{(k)} = \sum_{\substack{r, s, l: \\ s+r+l=k \\ l < k, r < k}} T_r^{(s)} f^{(l)}. \quad (2.17)$$

Note that equation (2.14) is nothing else than the classical Vlasov equation (see (1.12)) associated with the interaction ϕ (which will assume to be smooth). It is well known that the Vlasov equation can be solved by means of characteristics and fixed point. Moreover, the problems (2.15) are linear and can be solved by a recursive argument (see Section 6 below). Indeed, the source terms $\Theta^{(k)}$ involve only those coefficients $f^{(n)}$ with $n < k$, so that they are known by

the previous steps. We shall give a sense to the solutions $f^{(k)}(t)$, for $k \geq 1$, once we will have established precise assumptions on ϕ and $f_0^{(k)}$.

3. THE N -PARTICLE DYNAMICS

Consider a quantum system constituted by N identical particles. Its time evolution in the classical phase space is given by the Wigner-Liouville equation:

$$(\partial_t + V_N \cdot \nabla_{X_N}) W_N^\varepsilon = T_N^\varepsilon W_N^\varepsilon, \quad (3.1)$$

where $W_N^\varepsilon(X_N, V_N; t)$ is the Wigner function describing the state of the system,

$$X_N = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}, \quad V_N = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N},$$

and the pair $Z_N := (X_N, V_N)$ denotes the generic point in the classical N -particle phase space. Moreover,

$$(T_N^\varepsilon W_N^\varepsilon)(Z_N) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^{3N}} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} d\lambda \int dK_N \hat{U}_N(K_N) e^{iK_N \cdot V_N} (K_N \cdot \nabla_{V_N}) W_N^\varepsilon(X_N, V_N + \lambda \varepsilon K_N), \quad (3.2)$$

where $K_N = (k_1, \dots, k_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ and U_N is the (mean-field) interaction potential given by:

$$U_N(X_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq l < j \leq N}^N \phi(x_l - x_j). \quad (3.3)$$

We choose, as initial datum, the factorized state:

$$W_{N,0}^\varepsilon(X_N, V_N) = \prod_{j=1}^N f_0^\varepsilon(x_j, v_j), \quad (3.4)$$

where f_0^ε is the initial datum of the equation (2.1). Following [15], we expand

$$T_N^\varepsilon = T_N^{(0)} + \varepsilon T_N^{(1)} + \varepsilon^2 T_N^{(2)} + \dots \quad (3.5)$$

where, for n even we have

$$T_N^{(n)} = i(2\pi)^{-3N} C_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} dK_N \hat{U}(K_N) e^{iK_N \cdot X_N} (K_N \cdot \nabla_{V_N})^{n+1}, \quad (3.6)$$

C_n being constants depending on n , and, for n odd, we find

$$T_N^{(n)} = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Looking for a semiclassical expansion

$$W_N^\varepsilon(t) = W_N^{(0)}(t) + \varepsilon W_N^{(1)}(t) + \varepsilon^2 W_N^{(2)}(t) + \dots, \quad (3.8)$$

we first expand the initial datum

$$W_{N,0}^\varepsilon = W_{N,0}^{(0)} + \varepsilon W_{N,0}^{(1)} + \varepsilon^2 W_{N,0}^{(2)} + \dots \quad (3.9)$$

The coefficients $W_{N,0}^{(k)}$ are determined by (3.4) and (2.12) as

$$W_{N,0}^{(0)} = \prod_{j=1}^N f_0^{(0)}(x_j, v_j), \quad (3.10)$$

...

$$W_{N,0}^{(k)} = \sum_{\substack{s_1 \dots s_N \\ 0 \leq s_j \leq k \\ \sum_j s_j = k}} \prod_{j=1}^N f_0^{(s_j)}(x_j, v_j). \quad (3.11)$$

Note that $W_{N,0}^{(k)}$ is factorized only for $k = 0$.

By (3.8) and (3.5), we arrive to the sequence of problems:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + V_N \cdot \nabla_{X_N}) W_N^{(0)} = T_N^{(0)} W_N^{(0)}, \\ W_N^{(0)}(X_N, V_N; t) \Big|_{t=0} = W_{N,0}^{(0)}(X_N, V_N), \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + V_N \cdot \nabla_{X_N}) W_N^{(k)} = T_N^{(0)} W_N^{(k)} + \Theta_N^{(k)}, \\ W_N^{(k)}(X_N, V_N; t) \Big|_{t=0} = W_{N,0}^{(k)}(X_N, V_N), \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

for $k \geq 1$, where

$$\Theta_N^{(k)} = \sum_{0 \leq l < k} T_N^{(k-l)} W_N^{(l)}. \quad (3.14)$$

Note that $T_N^{(0)} = \nabla_{X_N} U_N \cdot \nabla_{V_N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \nabla_x \phi(x_i - x_j) \cdot \nabla_{v_i}$ is the classical Liouville operator, while the source terms $\Theta_N^{(k)}$, at each order k , are known by the previous steps. Note also that, under reasonable assumptions on the interaction potential ϕ , equation (3.12) can be solved by considering the Hamiltonian flow $\Phi^t(X_N, V_N)$, solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i = v_i \\ \dot{v}_i = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \nabla_x \phi(x_i - x_j). \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Indeed

$$W_N^{(0)}(X_N, V_N; t) = S_N(t) W_{N,0}^{(0)}(X_N, V_N) = W_{N,0}^{(0)}(\Phi^{-t}(X_N, V_N)), \quad (3.16)$$

where, from now on, we denote by S_N the flow generated by the Liouville operator $T_N^{(0)}$, while equations (3.13) can be solved by recurrence thanks to the Duhamel formula:

$$W_N^{(k)}(t) = S_N(t) W_{N,0}^{(k)} + \int_0^t dt_1 S_N(t - t_1) \Theta_N^{(k)}(t_1). \quad (3.17)$$

We conclude this section by expressing the operators $T_N^{(n)}$ (n even) in terms of the variables X_N, V_N . From (3.6), we find that:

$$T_N^{(n)} = \hat{T}_N^{(n)} + R_N^{(n)}, \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$\hat{T}_N^{(n)} = c_n \frac{(-1)^{n/2}}{N} \sum_{1 \leq l < j \leq N} D_x^{n+1} \phi(x_l - x_j) \cdot D_{v_l}^{n+1}, \quad (3.19)$$

where c_n is the same of (2.7), and

$$R_N^{(n)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq l < j \leq N} \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^3 \\ |k_1| + |k_2| = n+1}} C_{k_1, k_2} \frac{\partial^{n+1}}{\partial_{x_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{x_j}^{|k_2|}} \phi(x_l - x_j) \cdot \frac{\partial^{n+1}}{\partial_{v_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{v_j}^{|k_2|}}, \quad (3.20)$$

where, for $i = 1, 2$, $k_i = (k_{i,1}, k_{i,2}, k_{i,3})$, $|k_i| = k_{i,1} + k_{i,2} + k_{i,3}$, and

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1}}{\partial_{x_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{x_j}^{|k_2|}} = \frac{\partial^{|k_1|}}{\partial^{k_{1,1}} x_l^1 \partial^{k_{1,2}} x_l^2 \partial^{k_{1,3}} x_l^3} \frac{\partial^{|k_2|}}{\partial^{k_{2,1}} x_j^1 \partial^{k_{2,2}} x_j^2 \partial^{k_{2,3}} x_j^3}, \quad (3.21)$$

with $x_j = (x_j^1, x_j^2, x_j^3)$, $x_l = (x_l^1, x_l^2, x_l^3)$,

while C_{k_1, k_2} are suitable coefficients. The same holds for the derivatives with respect to the velocities.

We observe that, by the expression (3.20), we mean that the derivative of order $|k_1|$ is distributed over the three components of x_l in the same way in which it is distributed over the three components of v_l , and the same holds for the derivative of order $|k_2|$.

4. HIERARCHIES

One way to investigate the behavior of the N -particle system in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, is to consider the hierarchy associated with equation (3.1). More precisely, introducing the j -particle functions:

$$W_{N,j}^\varepsilon(X_j, V_j; t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)} \times \mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)}} dX_{N-j} dV_{N-j} W_N^\varepsilon(X_j, X_{N-j}, V_j, V_{N-j}; t), \quad (4.1)$$

a straightforward computation yields the following sequence of equations:

$$(\partial_t + V_j \cdot \nabla_{X_j}) W_{N,j}^\varepsilon = T_j^\varepsilon W_{N,j}^\varepsilon + \left(\frac{N-j}{N} \right) C_{j+1}^\varepsilon W_{N,j+1}^\varepsilon, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\text{with } W_{N,N}^\varepsilon = W_N^\varepsilon \text{ and } C_{N+1}^\varepsilon \equiv 0,$$

which, as usual, is called "hierarchy" because each equation is linked to the subsequent one. The operator T_j^ε (for a fixed j) describes the interaction of the first j particles (we recall that we are dealing with identical particles, thus, in order to refer to any group of j particles we can say "the first j particles" because we can rearrange them as we want) among themselves, while

the operator C_{j+1}^ε describes the interaction of the first j particles with the remaining $N - j$. The explicit form of such operators is:

$$\begin{aligned} (T_j^\varepsilon W_{N,j}^\varepsilon)(X_j, V_j) &= \\ &= \frac{i(2\pi)^{-3N}}{N} \sum_{1 \leq l < r \leq j} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} d\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dk \hat{\phi}(k) e^{ik \cdot (x_l - x_r)} (k \cdot \nabla_{v_l}) W_{N,j}^\varepsilon(X_j, V_{l-1}, v_l + \lambda \varepsilon k, V_{j-l}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (C_{j+1}^\varepsilon W_{N,j+1}^\varepsilon)(X_j, V_j) &= \\ &= i(2\pi)^{-3N} \sum_{l=1}^j \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} d\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dk \hat{\phi}(k) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} dx_{j+1} dv_{j+1} e^{ik \cdot (x_l - x_{j+1})} \\ &\quad (k \cdot \nabla_{v_l}) W_{N,j+1}^\varepsilon(X_j, x_{j+1}, V_{l-1}, v_l + \lambda \varepsilon k, V_{j-l}, v_{j+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Note now that $T_j^\varepsilon = O\left(\frac{j^2}{N}\right)$, thus we expect its action to be negligible in the limit. On the other hand, if we consider the sequence $\{f_j^\varepsilon(t)\}_j$, where $f_j^\varepsilon(t) = f_j^\varepsilon(X_j, V_j; t)$ is given by:

$$f_j^\varepsilon(X_j, V_j; t) = \prod_{k=1}^j f^\varepsilon(x_k, v_k; t) \quad (4.5)$$

and $f^\varepsilon(t)$ is the solution of the Wigner-Liouville equation associated with the Hartree dynamics (see (2.1)), we easily deduce the following hierarchy:

$$(\partial_t + V_j \cdot \nabla_{X_j}) f_j^\varepsilon = C_{j+1}^\varepsilon f_{j+1}^\varepsilon. \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, we expect that

$$W_{N,j}^\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow f_j^\varepsilon(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.7)$$

for any $t > 0$, provided that the same convergence holds at time $t = 0$. As we have already recalled in Section 1, such a result can indeed be proven under various assumptions on the interaction potential ϕ , both in the reduced density matrix formalism and in the Wigner one. This constitutes a validation of the Hartree equation in the mean-field limit. Nevertheless, as we have already remarked, a common feature of these results is that the limit is singularly behaving when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In fact, the operators involved in the above hierarchies are bounded in the norm appropriate to study the convergence, both in the reduced density matrix formalism and in the Wigner one, but their norm is diverging when ε goes to zero. This suggests to consider the semiclassical equations described in Sections 1 and 2. In this way, considering equations at each order in ε and analyzing the hierarchies associated with each of those equations, we have to deal with operators which are clearly independent of ε ($T_N^{(n)}$, for the N -particle case, and $T_k^{(n)}$ for the expansion associated with the Hartree dynamics), and we have to investigate only the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ without any dependence on ε . The price we have to pay is that now

those operators are unbounded, as it comes out for the classical mean-field limit we are going to discuss in the next section. Therefore, if we want to prove that the coefficient of order ε^k of the expansion of $W_{N,j}^\varepsilon$, namely:

$$W_{N,j}^{(k)}(X_j, V_j; t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)} \times \mathbb{R}^{3(N-j)}} dX_{N-j} dV_{N-j} W_N^{(k)}(X_j, X_{N-j}, V_j, V_{N-j}; t), \quad (4.8)$$

converges to the corresponding object for the Hartree flow, which is:

$$f_j^{(k)}(X_j, V_j; t) = \sum_{\substack{s_1 \dots s_j: \\ 0 \leq s_r \leq k \\ \sum_r s_r = k}} \prod_{r=1}^j f^{(s_r)}(x_r, v_r; t), \quad (4.9)$$

(where the one-particle functions $f^{(s_r)}(x_r, v_r; t)$ solve equation (2.14), if $s_r = 0$, and (2.15), for $s_r > 0$), the use of the hierarchy solved by $W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t)$ does not seem a good idea. In fact, even at level zero, when we have to deal with the classical mean-field limit, the hierarchy is very difficult to handle with. Such a hierarchy is given by:

$$(\partial_t + V_j \cdot \nabla_{X_j}) W_{N,j}^{(0)} = T_j^{(0)} W_{N,j}^{(0)} + \frac{N-j}{N} C_{j+1}^{(0)} W_{N,j+1}^{(0)}, \quad (4.10)$$

with

$$\left(T_j^{(0)} W_{N,j}^{(0)} \right) (X_j, V_j) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq l < r \leq j} \nabla_{x_l} \phi(x_l - x_r) \cdot \nabla_{v_l} W_{N,j}^{(0)}(X_j, V_j), \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(C_{j+1}^{(0)} W_{N,j+1}^{(0)} \right) (X_j, V_j) &= \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^j \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} dx_{j+1} dv_{j+1} \nabla_{x_l} \phi(x_l - x_{j+1}) \cdot \nabla_{v_l} W_{N,j+1}^{(0)}(X_j, x_{j+1}, V_j, v_{j+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Clearly these operators are unbounded (unless to make them act on analytical functions) because they involve derivatives with respect to the velocity variables. For this reason, to deal with the hierarchy is quite difficult and the obstacle which occurs in facing the higher order terms is precisely the same. However, in the classical case we can treat the convergence in a more natural way, avoiding to use the hierarchy. The idea is to control the j -particle marginals $W_{N,j}^{(0)}$ in terms of the expectation of the j -fold product of empirical measures with respect to the initial N -particle probability distribution (see Section 5 below). In the present paper we follow a similar strategy in dealing with the convergence of the higher order terms of the expansion. More precisely, we will express $W_{N,j}^{(k)}$ in terms of the expectation, with respect to the initial N -particle zero order coefficient (which is known to be a probability distribution), of suitable operators acting on empirical measures. The control of these objects will be obtained thanks

to some estimates of the derivatives of the classical flow with respect to the initial data (see Proposition 5.1).

5. THE CLASSICAL MEAN-FIELD LIMIT

The semiclassical expansion of the N -particle system leads us to consider the sequence of problems (3.12)-(3.13). The zero order equation (3.12) is purely classical and well understood. At this regard, let us remind some basic facts concerning the case of smooth potentials, which will be crucial in what follows.

The Vlasov equation (1.12) makes sense even for a generic probability measure ν because $\nabla\phi * \nu \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (thanks to the smoothness of ϕ) and, by using the characteristic flow associated with the equation and a fixed point argument, it is possible to prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution. Furthermore, introducing the Wasserstein distance $\mathcal{W}$ (e.g. [13]) based on a bounded metric in $\mathbb{R}^6$ to avoid unnecessary boundedness assumptions on the moments of the measures we deal with, it is possible to prove the following continuity property:

$$\mathcal{W}(\nu_t^1, \nu_t^2) \leq e^{Ct} \mathcal{W}(\nu_0^1, \nu_0^2) \quad (5.1)$$

where ν_0^1 and ν_0^2 are two probability measures and ν_t^1 and ν_t^2 are the weak solutions of the Vlasov equation with initial data given by ν_0^1 and ν_0^2 respectively (see again [13]). Moreover, for a configuration $Z_N = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}$, where $z_j = (x_j, v_j) \in \mathbb{R}^6$, consider the Hamiltonian flow

$$\Phi^t(X_N, V_N) = Z_N(t) = Z_N(t; Z_N), \quad (5.2)$$

with initial datum Z_N (see (3.15)), and construct the empirical measure $\mu_N(t)$ as follows:

$$\mu_N(t) := \mu_N(z|Z_N(t)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta(z - z_j(t)). \quad (5.3)$$

The basic remark is that $\mu_N(t)$ is a weak solution of the Vlasov equation, so that, by (5.1), we have:

$$\mu_N(t) \rightarrow f^{(0)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.4)$$

provided that

$$\mu_N \rightarrow f^{(0)}(0) = f_0^{(0)}, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\mu_N := \mu_N(z|Z_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta(z - z_j) \quad (5.6)$$

is the empirical distribution at time $t = 0$. Moreover, $f_0^{(0)}$ is a (possibly smooth) probability distribution and $f^{(0)}(t)$ is the solution of the Vlasov equation with initial datum $f_0^{(0)}$. Clearly, the convergences (5.4) and (5.5) hold with respect to the metric induced by $\mathcal{W}$ on the space of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^6$ and this is equivalent to the weak topology of probability measures.

Next, let us consider the (factorized) N -particle probability distribution $W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N) = \prod_{k=1}^N f_0^{(0)}(x_k, v_k)$ and let $W_N^{(0)}(t)$ be its time evolution according to the Liouville equation (3.16). We want to investigate the behavior of the j -particle marginals $W_{N,j}^{(0)}(t)$. Denoting by $\mathbb{E}_N$ the expectation with respect to $W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N)$, after straightforward computations, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_N [\mu_N(z'_1|Z_N(t)) \dots \mu_N(z'_j|Z_N(t))] &= \frac{N(N-1) \dots (N-j+1)}{N^j} W_{N,j}^{(0)}(Z'_j; t) + \\ &+ O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where $Z'_j = (z'_1 \dots z'_j)$ and $W_{N,j}^{(0)}(Z'_j; t) = W_{N,j}^{(0)}(Z'_j(t))$ (see (5.2)).

Consider now a typical sequence Z_N with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$, namely such that (5.5) holds. By the strong law of large numbers this happens a.e. with respect to $(f_0^{(0)})^{\otimes \infty}$ and by (5.4) and (5.7) we have:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_N [\mu_N(z'_1|Z_N(t)) \dots \mu_N(z'_j|Z_N(t))] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} W_{N,j}^{(0)}(Z'_j; t) = (f^{(0)})^{\otimes j}(Z'_j; t), \quad (5.8)$$

in the weak topology of probability measures. Thus propagation of chaos is proven, and, this is the remarkable fact, it has been done without using the hierarchy.

For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the quantum hierarchy is, in a certain sense, easier. In fact, in that situation the operators involved are bounded (as operators acting on the spaces appropriate for that context) and it is possible to realize the limit by using the hierarchy. On the contrary, in the quantum context we cannot use any characteristic flow and there is not any object analogous to the empirical measure. Nevertheless, if we consider the semiclassical expansion of the time evolved Wigner function, the higher order terms can be viewed as quantum corrections to the classical dynamics.

We now explain heuristically our approach fully exploited in Section 7.

The first correction to the Vlasov equation in the Hartree dynamics satisfies (see (2.11) and (2.12)):

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f^{(1)} = L(f^{(0)}) f^{(1)}, \\ f^{(1)}(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = f_0^{(1)}(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

(looking at the expression (2.17) for the source terms $\Theta^{(k)}$, we verify that $\Theta^{(1)} \equiv 0$). As we shall see in detail in the following section, our choice for the initial one-particle datum is a mixture of coherent states and each coefficient of the expansion it is given by suitable derivatives of the zero order distribution. In particular, the explicit form for $f_0^{(1)}$ is:

$$f_0^{(1)}(x, v) = D_G^2 f_0^{(0)}(x, v), \quad (5.10)$$

where D_G^2 is a suitable second order derivation operator (see formula (6.8) below in the case $k = 2$) involving derivatives with respect to the initial variables $z_1, \dots, z_N$.

As regard to the N -particle dynamics, looking at (3.11) in the case $k = 1$, we know that the initial datum for the coefficient of order one in ε is:

$$W_{N,0}^{(1)}(Z_N) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_0^{(1)}(z_j) \prod_{l \neq j}^N f_0^{(0)}(z_l) = \mathcal{D}^2 W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N), \quad (5.11)$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N D_{G,j}^2, \quad (5.12)$$

and $D_{G,j}^2$ is the operator D_G^2 relative to the variable $z_j \in \mathbb{R}^6$. Let us now define $\mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t)$ as the distribution acting on a test function u in the following way:

$$(u, \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t)) = \mathcal{D}^2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N u(z_l(t)) \right) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l,j=1}^N D_{G,j}^2 u(z_l(t)). \quad (5.13)$$

We remind that the operator $D_{G,j}^2$ involves derivatives with respect to the initial variables $z_1, \dots, z_N$, thus, if at time $t = 0$ we have $\mu_N \rightarrow f_0^{(0)}$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$ (in the weak sense of probability measures), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} (u, \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N) &= \mathcal{D}^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N u(z_l) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l,j=1}^N D_{G,j}^2 u(z_l) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N D_{G,j}^2 u(z_j) = \\ &= (D_G^2 u, \mu_N) \rightarrow (D_G^2 u, f_0^{(0)}) = (u, D_G^2 f_0^{(0)}) = (u, f_0^{(1)}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, by (5.11) and (5.14), we can conclude that:

$$\left(u, W_{N,1}^{(1)}(t)|_{t=0} \right) = (u, \mathbb{E}_N [\mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N]) \rightarrow (u, f_0^{(1)}) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.15)$$

By equation (3.13) for $k = 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + V_N \cdot \nabla_{X_N}) W_N^{(1)} &= \nabla_{X_N} U_N \cdot \nabla_{V_N} W_N^{(1)}, \\ W_N^{(1)}(Z_N; t)|_{t=0} &= W_{N,0}^{(1)}(Z_N), \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

namely, the classical Liouville equation. Therefore:

$$W_N^{(1)}(Z_N; t) = S_N(t) W_{N,0}^{(1)}(Z_N). \quad (5.17)$$

Finally, by virtue of (5.17) and (5.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(u, W_{N,1}^{(1)}(t)) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N S_N(t) W_{N,0}^{(1)}(Z_N) (u, \mu_N) = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N W_{N,0}^{(1)}(Z_N) (u, \mu_N(t)) = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N \mathcal{D}^2 W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N) (u, \mu_N(t)) = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N) (u, \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t)) = \\
&= (u, \mathbb{E}_N [\mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t)]) .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

Therefore, the behavior of $W_{N,1}^{(1)}(t)$ is determined by that of $\mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t)$ for any initial configuration Z_N which is typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$. Finally, since $\mu_N(t)$ solves:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \mu_N(t) = (\nabla \phi * \mu_N(t)) \cdot \nabla_v \mu_N(t) \\ \mu_N(t)|_{t=0} = \mu_N, \end{cases} \tag{5.19}$$

applying $\mathcal{D}^2$, we get:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t) = L(\mu_N(t)) \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t) + R_N, \\ \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N(t)|_{t=0} = \mathcal{D}^2 \mu_N, \end{cases} \tag{5.20}$$

where R_N is a term involving objects of the form $\sum_j (D_{G,j} \mu_N(t)) (D_{G,j} \mu_N(t))$ which, as we shall see later, are of order $1/N$ when tested versus smooth functions. The equation (5.20) is similar to (5.9), except for the presence of the term R_N and for the fact that we have $L(\mu_N(t))$ instead of $L(f^{(0)})$. Therefore, the proof of the convergence of $W_{N,1}^{(1)}(t)$ to $f^{(1)}(t)$ reduces to that of a stability property for the solution of (5.9) with respect to suitable weak topologies. Propositions 6.1 and 6.2 below will provide us such property.

The general case $k > 1$ is only technically more complicated because of the presence of source terms, but the main ideas are those presented here.

We conclude by establishing a Proposition controlling the size of the derivatives of the Hamilton flow (3.15) with respect to the initial data.

From now on we shall denote by C a positive constant, independent of N , possibly changing from line to line.

Proposition 5.1

Let $z_i(t) = (x_i(t), v_i(t))$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ be the solution of equations (3.15) with initial datum $z_i = (x_i, v_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Let $z_i^\beta \forall \beta = 1, \dots, 6$ be the β -th component of $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^6$. If the pair interaction potential ϕ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and the derivatives of any order of ϕ are uniformly bounded,

then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k z_i^\beta(t)}{\partial z_{j_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial z_{j_k}^{\alpha_k}} \right| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k^{(i)}}}, \quad (5.21)$$

where $I := (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ is any sequence of possibly repeated indices and $d_k^{(i)}$ is the number of different indices in I which are also different from i .

The physical significance of (5.21) is obvious. In the mean-field context, the quantity $z_i(t)$ depends weakly on z_j if $j \neq i$ for each $t > 0$. Actually $\frac{\partial z_i^\beta(t)}{\partial z_j^\alpha} = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$ while $\frac{\partial z_i^\beta(t)}{\partial z_i^\alpha} = O(1)$ and these two estimates give rise to (5.21) in the case $k = 1$. Estimate (5.21) says that for each derivative of any order with respect to some z_j of $z_i(t)$, we gain a factor $1/N$. We have also the following corollary whose straightforward proof will be omitted.

Proposition 5.2

Let $U = U(Z_N(t))$ be a function of the time evolved configuration $Z_N(t)$ of the form:

$$U(Z_N(t)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u(z_i(t)),$$

where $u \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. Then, if the pair interaction potential ϕ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 5.1, the following estimate holds:

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k U(Z_N(t))}{\partial z_{j_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial z_{j_k}^{\alpha_k}} \right| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}, \quad (5.22)$$

where d_k is the number of different indices in the sequence $I = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$.

The proof of Proposition 5.1 will be given in Appendix A.

6. RESULTS AND TECHNICAL PRELIMINARIES

We choose, as initial condition for the one-particle Wigner function, a mixture of coherent states. The Wigner function associated with a pure coherent state centered at the point (x_0, v_0) is given by:

$$w(x, v|x_0, v_0) = \frac{1}{(\pi\varepsilon)^3} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\varepsilon}} e^{-\frac{(v-v_0)^2}{\varepsilon}}. \quad (6.1)$$

Let now $g = g(x, v)$ be a smooth probability density on the one-particle phase space independent of ε (see Hypotheses H below). Then we define:

$$f_0(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} dx_0 dv_0 w(x, v|x_0, v_0) g(x_0, v_0). \quad (6.2)$$

Using the standard notation $z = (x, v)$ and $z_0 = (x_0, v_0)$, (6.2) is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(z) &= \frac{1}{(\pi\varepsilon)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} dz_0 e^{-\frac{(z-z_0)^2}{\varepsilon}} g(z_0) = \\ &= \frac{1}{(\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} d\zeta e^{-\zeta^2} g(z - \sqrt{\varepsilon}\zeta). \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Expanding

$$\begin{aligned} g(z - \sqrt{\varepsilon}\zeta) &= g(z) - (\zeta \cdot \nabla_z) g(z) \sqrt{\varepsilon} + (\zeta \cdot \nabla_z)^2 g(z) \frac{(\sqrt{\varepsilon})^2}{2} + \dots \\ &\dots - (\zeta \cdot \nabla_z)^{2n-1} g(z) \frac{(\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2n-1}}{(2n-1)!} + (\zeta \cdot \nabla_z)^{2n} g(z) \frac{(\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2n}}{(2n)!} + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

and performing the gaussian integrations (which cancels the terms with the odd powers of $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$), we readily arrive to the following expansion for the Wigner function f_0 :

$$f_0 = f_0^{(0)} + \varepsilon f_0^{(1)} + \dots + \varepsilon^n f_0^{(n)} + \dots, \quad (6.5)$$

where

$$f_0^{(0)} = g, \quad (6.6)$$

$$f_0^{(n)} = D_G^{2n} f_0^{(0)} \quad \text{for } n \geq 1, \quad (6.7)$$

and D_G^k (G stands for "Gaussian"), for each $k > 0$, is the following derivation operator with respect to the variable $z = (x, v)$:

$$D_G^k = \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k: \\ \alpha_j = 1, \dots, 6}} C_G(\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k) \frac{\partial^k}{\partial z^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial z^{\alpha_k}}, \quad (6.8)$$

where

$$C_G(\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k) = \frac{1}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} d\zeta e^{-\zeta^2} \prod_{j=1}^k \zeta^{\alpha_j}. \quad (6.9)$$

Therefore, $C_G(\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k)$ is equal to zero for each sequence $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k$ in which at least one index appears an odd number of times.

Hypotheses H:

In the present paper we assume that the probability density $g = f_0^{(0)} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, thus (6.7) make sense for any $n \geq 1$. As regard to the pair interaction potential ϕ , we assume that $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, that any derivative of ϕ is uniformly bounded (in order to be able to apply Proposition 5.1) and that ϕ is spherically symmetric.

Remark 6.1:

In this paper we consider a completely factorized N -particle initial state. Furthermore the one-particle state is a mixture and this automatically excludes the Bose statistics.

Remark 6.2:

We made the choice to expand fully the initial state f_0 according to equation (6.5). Another possibility is to assume the (ε dependent) state f_0 (which is a probability measure in the present case) as initial condition for the Vlasov problem and, consequently, $f_0^{(k)} = 0$ for the problems (2.15). Now the coefficients $f^{(k)}(t)$ are ε dependent but this does not change deeply our analysis because f_0 is smooth, uniformly in ε .

Under hypotheses H, we can give a sense to the linear problem (2.15) for any $k \geq 1$, by virtue of the following proposition, whose (straightforward) proof will be given in Appendix B.

Proposition 6.1

Consider the following initial value problem:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \gamma = L(h)\gamma + \Theta, \\ \gamma(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = \gamma_0(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

with $\gamma_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, $h = h(x, v; t)$ is such that $|\nabla_v h| \in \mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$, $\Theta = \Theta(x, v; t)$ is such that $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$.

Then, there exists a unique solution $\gamma = \gamma(x, v; t)$ of (6.10), such that $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$, given by an explicit series expansion.

Furthermore, denoting by Σ_h the flow generated by $L(h)$, we have that $\Sigma_h(t, 0)\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ provided that $\nabla_v h \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$.

The main goal of the present paper is to compare the j -particle semiclassical expansion associated with the N -particle flow, namely $W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t)$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, with the corresponding coefficients $f_j^{(k)}(t)$ of the expansion:

$$f_j^\varepsilon(t) = f_j^{(0)}(t) + \varepsilon f_j^{(1)}(t) + \dots + \varepsilon^k f_j^{(k)}(t) + \dots, \quad (6.11)$$

where $f_j^{(k)}(t)$ is given by (4.9). The main result is the following.

Theorem 6.1

Under the Hypotheses H, for all $t > 0$, for any integers k and j , the following limit holds in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{3j} \times \mathbb{R}^{3j})$:

$$W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow f_j^{(k)}(t). \quad (6.12)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 6.3:

As we shall see in the sequel, the convergence (6.12) is slightly stronger than the convergence in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{3j} \times \mathbb{R}^{3j})$. Indeed, the sequence $W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t)$ converges also when it is tested on functions in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3j} \times \mathbb{R}^{3j})$, namely, the space of functions which are uniformly bounded and infinitely differentiable. Such kind of convergence, which is natural in the present context, will be called $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weak convergence.

Proposition 6.2

Let $\gamma_N(x, v; t)$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ (for each t) satisfying:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \gamma_N = L(h_N) \gamma_N + \Theta_N, \\ \gamma_N(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = \gamma_{N,0}(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (6.13)$$

where $\gamma_{N,0}, \Theta_N$ are sequences in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. We assume that:

- i) $h_N(x, v; t)$ is a sequence of probability measures converging, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, to a measure $h(t)dx dv$ with a density $h(t) \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ and such that $|\nabla_v h| \in \mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$.
- ii) for all u_1, u_2 in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, there exists a constant $C = C(u_1, u_2) > 0$, not depending on N , such that:

$$\|u_1 * (u_2 \gamma_N)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} < C < +\infty \quad \text{for any } t. \quad (6.14)$$

- iii) $\gamma_{N,0} \rightarrow \gamma_0$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weakly, $\gamma_0 = \gamma_0(x, v)$ is a function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$.
 - iv) $\Theta_N \rightarrow \Theta$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weakly, $\Theta = \Theta(x, v; t)$ is a function in $\mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$.
- Then:

$$\gamma_N \rightarrow \gamma, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty\text{-weakly}, \quad (6.15)$$

where γ is the unique solution of the problem (6.10) in $\mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$.

For the proof, see Appendix B.

7. CONVERGENCE

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6.1.

By (3.17) and (3.14), for $k \geq 0$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} W_N^{(k)}(Z_N; t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{r_1 \dots r_n: \\ r_j > 0 \\ \sum r_j = k-r}} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \\ &\quad S_N(t - t_1) T_N^{(r_1)} S_N(t_1 - t_2) \dots T_N^{(r_n)} S_N(t_n) W_{N,0}^{(r)}(Z_N). \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

It is useful to remind that the only non-vanishing terms in (7.1) are those for which all $r_1, \dots, r_n$ are even.

According to (3.11) and (6.7),

$$W_{N,0}^{(r)}(Z_N) = \sum_{\substack{s_1 \dots s_N \\ 0 \leq s_j \leq r \\ \sum_j s_j = r}} \prod_{j=1}^N \left(D_{G,j}^{2s_j} f_0^{(0)}(z_j) \right), \quad (7.2)$$

where $D_{G,j}^k$ is defined in (6.8) and the extra symbol j means that this operator acts on the variable z_j . Defining the operator $\mathcal{D}^{2r}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^0 &= 1, \\ \mathcal{D}^{2r} &= \sum_{\substack{s_1 \dots s_N \\ 0 \leq s_j \leq r \\ \sum_j s_j = r}} \prod_{j=1}^N D_{G,j}^{2s_j}, \quad r \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

we have:

$$W_{N,0}^{(r)}(Z_N) = \mathcal{D}^{2r} W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N) \quad \forall r \geq 0. \quad (7.4)$$

In order to investigate the behavior of the j -particle functions $W_{N,j}^{(k)}(Z_j; t)$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$, we consider the following object, for a given configuration $Z'_j = (z'_1 \dots z'_j)$:

$$\omega_{N,j}^{(k)}(Z'_j; t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{6N}} dZ_N W_N^{(k)}(Z_N; t) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N) \dots \mu_N(z'_j | Z_N). \quad (7.5)$$

In the end of the section, we will show that (7.5) is asymptotically equivalent to $W_{N,j}^{(k)}(Z'_j; t)$.

From (7.1), (7.4) and (7.5), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{N,j}^{(k)}(Z'_j; t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{r_1 \dots r_n \\ r_j > 0 \\ \sum r_j = k-r}} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^{6N}} dZ_N \mu_{N,j}(Z'_j | Z_N) \\ &\quad S_N(t - t_1) T_N^{(r_1)} S_N(t_1 - t_2) \dots T_N^{(r_n)} S_N(t_n) \mathcal{D}^{2r} W_{N,0}^{(0)}(Z_N), \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

where

$$\mu_{N,j}(Z'_j | Z_N) = \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N) \dots \mu_N(z'_j | Z_N). \quad (7.7)$$

Integrating by parts, reminding that each r_j is even and that each $T_N^{(r_j)}$ involves derivatives of order $r_j + 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{N,j}^{(k)}(Z'_j; t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{r}_n: r_j > 0 \\ |\mathbf{r}_n| = k-r}} \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_N \left[\mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) T_N^{(r_{n-1})}(t_{n-1}) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_{N,j}(Z'_j | Z_N(t)) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_n$ is the sequence of positive integers $r_1, \dots, r_n$, $|\mathbf{r}_n| = \sum_{j=1}^n r_j$ and $Z_N(t)$ is the Hamiltonian flow defined in (5.2). Moreover $\mathbf{t}_n = t_1 \dots t_n$ and $\int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n$ denotes the integral over the simplex $0 < t_n < t_{n-1} < \dots < t_1 < t$. Finally, $\mathbb{E}_N$ stands for the expectation with respect to the N -particle density $W_{N,0}^{(0)}$ and

$$T_N^{(r)}(t) = S_N(-t) T_N^{(r)} S_N(t). \quad (7.9)$$

Therefore, the objects we have to investigate in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_j^{(k)}(Z'_j; t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{r}_n: r_j > 0 \\ |\mathbf{r}_n| = k-r}} \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n \eta_j(Z'_j; t, r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N), \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

(for any configuration Z_N , typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$), where η_j is given by:

$$\eta_j(Z'_j; t, r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N) = \mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) T_N^{(r_{n-1})}(t_{n-1}) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_{N,j}(Z'_j | Z_N(t)). \quad (7.11)$$

Note that:

$$\nu_j^{(0)}(Z'_j; t) = \mu_{N,j}(Z'_j | Z_N(t)). \quad (7.12)$$

We start by analyzing the behavior of $\nu_j^{(k)}$ in the cases $j = 1, 2$, thus we are lead to consider:

$$\eta_1(z'_1; t, r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N) = \mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) T_N^{(r_{n-1})}(t_{n-1}) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t)), \quad (7.13)$$

and

$$\eta_2(z'_1, z'_2; t, r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N) = \mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) T_N^{(r_{n-1})}(t_{n-1}) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_{N,2}(Z'_2 | Z_N(t)). \quad (7.14)$$

It is useful to stress that the operators $T_N^{(r_j)}(t_j)$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) and $\mathcal{D}^{2r}$ act as suitable distributional derivatives with respect to the variables Z_N . To evaluate η_1 , let us first analyze

the action of $T_N^{(r)}(\tau)$. By (7.9) and (3.18), for any function $G = G(Z_N)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(T_N^{(r)}(\tau) G\right)(Z_N) &= S_N(-\tau) \left(\hat{T}_N^{(r)} + R_N^{(r)}\right) (S_N(\tau) G)(Z_N) = \\ &= (-1)^{r/2} \frac{C_r}{N} \sum_{j,l} S_N(-\tau) D_x^{r+1} \phi(x_j - x_l) \cdot D_{v_j}^{r+1} (S_N(\tau) G)(Z_N) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l,j=1}^N \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^3 \\ |k_1| + |k_2| = r+1}} C_{k_1, k_2} S_N(-\tau) \frac{\partial^{r+1}}{\partial_{x_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{x_j}^{|k_2|}} \phi(x_l - x_j) \cdot \frac{\partial^{r+1}}{\partial_{v_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{v_j}^{|k_2|}} (S_N(\tau) G)(Z_N). \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

Note that the derivatives involved here are done with respect to the variables at time $t = 0$.

Denoting by $D_{z_j}^r$ any derivative of order r with respect to a variable z_j at time $t = 0$, we observe that:

$$S_N(-t) D_{z_j}^r G(Z_N) = \left(D_{z_j}^r G\right)(Z_N(t)) = D_{z_j}^r(t) (S_N(-t) G)(Z_N), \quad (7.16)$$

where, by $D_{z_j}^r(t)$, we denote the same derivative of order r with respect to the variable $z_j(t)$. Then, by (7.16) and (7.15):

$$\begin{aligned} \left(T_N^{(r)}(\tau) G\right)(Z_N) &= S_N(-\tau) \left(\hat{T}_N^{(r)} + R_N^{(r)}\right) S_N(\tau) G(Z_N) = \\ &= (-1)^{r/2} \frac{C_r}{N} \sum_{j,l} \left(D_x^{r+1} \phi\right)(x_j(\tau) - x_l(\tau)) \cdot D_{v_j}^{r+1}(\tau) G(Z_N) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l,j=1}^N \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^3 \\ |k_1| + |k_2| = r+1}} C_{k_1, k_2} \left(\frac{\partial^{r+1}}{\partial_{x_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{x_j}^{|k_2|}} \phi\right)(x_l(\tau) - x_j(\tau)) \cdot \frac{\partial^{r+1}}{\partial_{v_l}^{|k_1|} \partial_{v_j}^{|k_2|}}(\tau) G(Z_N). \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

Therefore, in computing the action of $T_N^{(r)}(\tau)$, we have to consider derivatives with respect to the variables at time τ . As a consequence, we have to deal with a complicated function of the configuration Z_N which, however, we do not need to make explicit, as we shall see in a moment.

On the basis of the previous considerations, we compute the time derivative of η_1 by applying the operators $\mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) T_N^{(r_{n-1})}(t_{n-1}) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1)$ to the Vlasov equation:

$$(\partial_t + v'_1 \cdot \nabla_{x'_1}) \mu_N(t) = (\nabla_{x'_1} \phi * \mu_N(t)) \cdot \nabla_{v'_1} \mu_N(t). \quad (7.18)$$

In doing this we have to compute

$$\mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) T_N^{(r_{n-1})}(t_{n-1}) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t)) \mu_N(z'_2 | Z_N(t)). \quad (7.19)$$

Now we select the contribution in which each $T_N^{(r_\ell)}(t_\ell)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{2r}$ apply either on $\mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t))$ or to $\mu_N(z'_2 | Z_N(t))$. The other contribution involves terms in which are present products of derivatives with respect to the same variable. By Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 we expect

those terms to be negligible (in the $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weak sense) in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore we obtain the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + v'_1 \cdot \nabla_{x'_1}) \eta_1(z'_1, t, r, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_n, Z_N) &= L(\mu_N(t)) \eta_1(z'_1, t, r, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_n, Z_N) + \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq r} \sum_{0 \leq m \leq n} \sum_{\substack{I \subset I_n: \\ |I|=m, \\ 0 < |\underline{\mathbf{r}}_I| + \ell < k}} (\nabla_{x'_1} \phi * \eta_1(\cdot, t, \ell, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_I, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_I, Z_N)) \cdot \nabla_{v'_1} \eta_1(z'_1, t, r - \ell, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_{I_n \setminus I}, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_{I_n \setminus I}, Z_N) + \\ &+ E_N^1, \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

where E_N^1 is an error term which will be proven to be negligible in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ in Appendix C. In (7.20) we used the notations:

$$I_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \quad I \text{ is any subset of } I_n, \quad \underline{\mathbf{r}}_I = \{r_j\}_{j \in I}, \quad \underline{\mathbf{t}}_I = \{t_j\}_{j \in I}. \quad (7.21)$$

Next, we compute the time derivative of $\nu_1^{(k)}(t)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + v'_1 \cdot \nabla_{x'_1}) \nu_1^{(k)} &= \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{|\underline{\mathbf{r}}_n|: \\ r_j > 0 \\ |\underline{\mathbf{r}}_n| = k-r}} \int_0^t dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_3 \dots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \eta_1(z'_1; t, r, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_n, Z_N) \Big|_{t_1=t} + \\ &+ \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{|\underline{\mathbf{r}}_n|: \\ r_j > 0 \\ |\underline{\mathbf{r}}_n| = k-r}} \int_{ord}^t d\underline{\mathbf{t}}_n (\partial_t + v'_1 \cdot \nabla_{x'_1}) \eta_1(z'_1; t, r, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_n, Z_N). \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

In evaluating the first term on the right hand side of (7.22), we are lead to consider η_1 evaluated in $t = t_1$. Thus, according to the expression of η_1 (see (7.13)), we have to deal with:

$$T_N^{(r_1)}(t) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t)) = S_N(-t) T_N^{(r_1)} \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N). \quad (7.23)$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} T_N^{(r_1)}(t) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t)) &= (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \left(D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi * \mu_N(t) \right) (x'_1) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t)) = \\ &= (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \int dx'_2 dv'_2 D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi(x'_1 - x'_2) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} \mu_N(x'_1, v'_1 | Z_N(t)) \mu_N(x'_2, v'_2 | Z_N(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (7.24)$$

where the term involving off-diagonal derivatives, namely $R_N^{(r_1)}$ (see (3.20)), disappears because both the derivatives and the empirical distribution are evaluated at time t . Hence we compute

η_1 in $t = t_1$ and, inserting it in the first term of the right hand side of (7.22), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{r}_n: r_j > 0 \\ |\mathbf{r}_n| = k-r}} \int_0^t dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_3 dt_3 \dots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \eta_1(z'_1; t, r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N) \Big|_{t_1=t} = \\ & = \sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ r_1 \text{ even}}} (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \int dx'_2 dv'_2 D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi(x'_1 - x'_2) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} \nu_2^{(k-r_1)}(x'_1, v'_1, x'_2, v'_2; t). \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

Let us come back now to equation (7.22). It is useful to observe that:

$$\int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n \sum_{\substack{I \subset I_n: \\ |I|=m}} = \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_I \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_{I_n \setminus I}. \quad (7.26)$$

Then, putting together (7.22), (7.25), (7.20) and (7.26), we obtain the following equation for $\nu_1^{(k)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + v'_1 \cdot \nabla_{x'_1}) \nu_1^{(k)}(x'_1, v'_1; t) &= L(\mu_N(t)) \nu_1^{(k)}(x'_1, v'_1; t) + \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ r_1 \text{ even}}} (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \int dx'_2 dv'_2 D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi(x'_1 - x'_2) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} \nu_2^{(k-r_1)}(x'_1, v'_1, x'_2, v'_2; t) + \\ &+ \sum_{0 < \ell < k} \left(\nabla_{x'_1} \phi * \nu_1^{(\ell)}(t) \right) \cdot \nabla_{v'_1} \nu_1^{(k-\ell)}(t) + E_N^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7.27)$$

with initial datum given by:

$$\nu_1^{(k)}(x'_1, v'_1; t)|_{t=0} = \eta_1((z'_1; 0, k, \mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{t}_0, Z_N) = \mathcal{D}^{2k} \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N). \quad (7.28)$$

Here E_N^2 arises from E_N^1 (see (7.20)). Now, we want to prove that:

$$\nu_1^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow f^{(k)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.29)$$

and

$$\nu_2^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow f_2^{(k)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.30)$$

for any configuration Z_N such that $\mu_N \rightarrow f_0^{(0)}$ in the weak sense of probability measure (namely, for any Z_N typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$). As a consequence, reminding that $\nu_1^{(k)}(t)$ and $\nu_2^{(k)}(t)$ are equal to $\omega_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)$ and $\omega_{N,2}^{(k)}(t)$ respectively, a.e. with respect to $W_{N,0}^{(0)}$, (7.29) and (7.30) are equivalent to:

$$\omega_{N,1}^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow f^{(k)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.31)$$

and

$$\omega_{N,2}^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow f_2^{(k)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}. \quad (7.32)$$

As we already remarked, the $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weak convergence implies the convergence in $\mathcal{S}'$, therefore, (7.31) and (7.32) imply the convergence of $\omega_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)$ to $f^{(k)}(t)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ and of $\omega_{N,2}^{(k)}(t)$ to $f_2^{(k)}(t)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^6)$.

7.1. One and two-particle convergence. In evaluating the behavior of $\nu_1^k(t)$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$, we note that it solves the initial value problem (7.27)-(7.28) for which we want to use Proposition 6.2. First, however, we have to verify the assumptions. The first one, namely **i)**, is verified as follows by the considerations developed in Section 5.

Now, we have to check that assumption **ii)** is satisfied, namely, we have to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall u_1, u_2 \text{ in } \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \\ & \text{there exists a constant } C = C(u_1, u_2) > 0, \text{ independent of } N, \text{ such that:} \\ & \left\| u_1 * \left(u_2 \nu_1^{(k)}(t) \right) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} < C \quad \text{for any } t. \end{aligned} \quad (7.33)$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| u_1 * \left(u_2 \nu_1^{(k)}(t) \right) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} = \sup_{x'_1, v'_1} \left| \int dy dw u_1(x'_1 - y, v'_1 - w) u_2(y, w) \nu_1^{(k)}(y, w; t) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{r}_n: r_j > 0 \\ |\mathbf{r}_n| = k-r}} \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n \\ & \sup_{x'_1, v'_1} \left| \int dy dw u_1(x'_1 - y, v'_1 - w) u_2(y, w) \eta_1(y, w; t; r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N) \right| = \\ & = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{r}_n: r_j > 0 \\ |\mathbf{r}_n| = k-r}} \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n \\ & \sup_{x'_1, v'_1} \left| \int dy dw (u_1(x'_1 - y, v'_1 - w) u_2(y, w)) \mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(y, w | Z_N(t)) \right| = \\ & = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{r}_n: r_j > 0 \\ |\mathbf{r}_n| = k-r}} \int_{ord}^t d\mathbf{t}_n \\ & \sup_{x'_1, v'_1} \left| \int dy dw g(x'_1, v'_1, y, w) \mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(y, w | Z_N(t)) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (7.34)$$

where we used the notation $g(x'_1, v'_1, y, w) := u_1(x'_1 - y, v'_1 - w) u_2(y, w)$ and, clearly, we have $g(x'_1, v'_1, \cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any x'_1 and v'_1 and $g(\cdot, \cdot, y, w) \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any y and w . By some estimates which will be proven in Appendix C (see Lemma C.2), we are guaranteed that, applying the operator $\mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1)$ on the empirical measure $\mu_N(t)$ and integrating

versus a function in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ we obtain a quantity uniformly bounded in N . This feature, by virtue of the good properties of the function g ensures that (7.34) is finite.

Let us now look at the initial datum for $\nu_1^{(k)}(t)$, in order to verify assumption **iii**).

From (7.28) we know that $\nu_1^{(k)}(0) = \mathcal{D}^{2k}\mu_N \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. As regard to its limiting behavior, we find that:

$$\nu_1^{(k)}(t)\Big|_{t=0} = \mathcal{D}^{2k}\mu_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\substack{I \subset I_N \\ |I|=n}} \sum_{\substack{s_j: j \in I \\ 1 \leq s_j \leq k \\ \sum_j s_j = k}} \prod_{j \in I} D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \mu_N, \quad (7.35)$$

where $I_N = \{1, \dots, N\}$. For our convenience, we have written the action of the operator $\mathcal{D}^{2k}$ in a equivalent and slightly different way from that we used in (7.3).

We realize that the only surviving term in the sum (7.35) is that with $n = 1$. Hence:

$$\nu_1^{(k)}(t)\Big|_{t=0} = \sum_{j=1}^N D_{G,j}^{2k} \mu_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N D_{G,j}^{2k} \delta(z'_1 - z_j) = D_G^{2k} \mu_N. \quad (7.36)$$

Therefore we can conclude, by using the mean-field limit:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(u, \nu_1^{(k)}(t)\Big|_{t=0}\right) &= (u, D_G^{2k} \mu_N) = \\ &= (D_G^{2k} u, \mu_N) \rightarrow (D_G^{2k} u, f_0^{(0)}) = (u, D_G^{2k} f_0^{(0)}) = (u, f_0^{(k)}), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \\ &\forall u \text{ in } \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3). \end{aligned} \quad (7.37)$$

Thus, $f_0^{(k)}$ plays the role of γ_0 in Proposition 6.2 and it is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ because $f_0^{(0)} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$.

We conclude the convergence proof (for the one and two-particle functions) by induction. For $k = 0$ we know that, for any configuration Z_N which is typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$, we have:

$$\nu_1^{(0)}(t) = \mu_N(t) \rightarrow f^{(0)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7.38)$$

in the weak sense of probability measures, and, as a consequence, the convergence holds $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ – weakly. Moreover

$$\nu_2^{(0)}(t) = \mu_N(t) \otimes \mu_N(t) \rightarrow f_2^{(0)}(t) = f^{(0)}(t) \otimes f^{(0)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7.39)$$

in the weak sense of probability measures, and, as a consequence, the convergence holds $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ – weakly.

We make the following inductive assumptions for all $h < k$:

$$\nu_1^{(h)}(t) \rightarrow f^{(h)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.40)$$

for any configuration Z_N which is typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$, and

$$\nu_2^{(h)}(t) \rightarrow f_2^{(h)}(t) = \sum_{0 \leq q \leq h} f^{(q)}(t) f^{(h-q)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.41)$$

for any configuration Z_N which is typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$.

Now we want to prove that (7.40) and (7.41) hold also for $h = k$.

Thanks to (7.40), we can affirm that:

$$\sum_{0 < \ell < k} \left(\nabla_{x'_1} \phi * \nu_1^{(\ell)} \right) \cdot \nabla_{v'_1} \nu_1^{(k-\ell)} \rightarrow \sum_{0 < \ell < k} \left(\nabla_{x'_1} \phi * f^{(\ell)} \right) \cdot \nabla_{v'_1} f^{(k-\ell)} = \sum_{0 < \ell < k} T_\ell^{(0)} f^{(k-\ell)},$$

$$\mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.42)$$

and, thanks to (7.41), have:

$$\sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ r_1 \text{ even}}} (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \int dx'_2 dv'_2 D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi(x'_1 - x'_2) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} \nu_2^{(k-r_1)}(x'_1, v'_1, x'_2, v'_2; t)$$

$$\downarrow \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ r_1 \text{ even}}} (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \int dx'_2 dv'_2 D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi(x'_1 - x'_2) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} f_2^{(k-r_1)}(x'_1, v'_1, x'_2, v'_2; t) =$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ r_1 \text{ even}}} \sum_{0 \leq q \leq k-r_1} (-1)^{r_1/2} c_{r_1} \int dx'_2 dv'_2 D_{x'_1}^{r_1+1} \phi(x'_1 - x'_2) f^{(k-r_1)}(x'_2, v'_2; t) \cdot D_{v'_1}^{r_1+1} f^{(q)}(x'_1, v'_1; t) =$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ r_1 \text{ even}}} \sum_{0 \leq q \leq k-r_1} T_q^{(r_1)} f^{(k-r_1-q)}(t). \quad (7.43)$$

At the end, putting together (7.42) and (7.43), we find that the sum of the source terms in equation (7.27) converges $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weakly to:

$$\sum_{0 < \ell < k} T_\ell^{(0)} f^{(k-\ell)} + \sum_{\substack{0 < r_1 \leq k \\ 0 \leq q \leq k-r_1}} T_q^{(r_1)} f^{(k-r_1-q)}, \quad (7.44)$$

which plays the role of Θ in Proposition 6.2 and it is easy to check that it is in $\mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$. Therefore, we can apply Proposition 6.2 claiming that, for any typical configuration Z_N with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$, $\nu_1^{(k)}(t)$ converges $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weakly to the solution of the problem (6.10). Looking at (2.15) and (2.17), we realize that we obtained the equation satisfied by $f^{(k)}(t)$.

In order to "close" the recurrence procedure, it remains to show the two-particle convergence at order k . It follows from the one-particle analysis and from the following computation

(see (7.14)):

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_2(z'_1, z'_2; t, r, \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n, Z_N) = \\ & = \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} \sum_{0 \leq m \leq n} \sum_{\substack{I: I \subseteq I_n \\ |I|=m}} \eta_1(z'_1; t, \ell, \mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{t}_I, Z_N) \eta_1(z'_2; t, k - \ell, \mathbf{r}_{I_n \setminus I}, \mathbf{t}_{I_n \setminus I}, Z_N) + R_N^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7.45)$$

where R_N^2 is a remainder arising from the action of the operator $\mathcal{D}^{2r} T_N^{(r_n)}(t_n) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1)$ on a product of two empirical measures $\mu_N(t)$. In Appendix C we will see that it is vanishing in the limit. As a consequence, $\nu_2^{(k)}$ (see (7.10) for $j = 2$) is such that:

$$\nu_2^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{0 \leq q \leq k} \nu_1^{(q)}(t) \nu_1^{(k-q)}(t) + o(1), \quad (7.46)$$

in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, from the inductive assumption (7.40) and from the one-particle convergence at order k , we conclude that:

$$\nu_2^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow \sum_{0 \leq q \leq k} f^{(q)}(t) f^{(k-q)}(t) = f_2^{(k)}(t), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (7.47)$$

for any configuration Z_N which is typical with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$. Thus, we have just proven the convergence of $\omega_{N,j}^{(k)}$ in the cases $j = 1, j = 2$.

7.2. j -particle convergence. As for $j = 2$, the j -particle convergence can be reduced by the one-particle control. Indeed by (7.10) and (7.11) we have:

$$\nu_j^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{\substack{s_1 \dots s_j \\ 0 \leq s_m \leq k \\ \sum_m s_m = k}} \prod_{m=1}^j \nu_1^{(s_m)}(t) + R_N^j, \quad (7.48)$$

with $R_N^j \rightarrow 0$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Again the error term R_N^j arises from the presence of products of derivatives with respect to the same variable. In conclusion, the result we proved for $\nu_1^{(k)}(t)$, together with the estimates proven in Appendix C, is sufficient to guarantee the $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weak convergence of $\nu_j^{(k)}(t)$ to $f_j^{(k)}(t)$ for any j (for any typical configuration Z_N with respect to $f_0^{(0)}$), and, as a consequence, the $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weak convergence of $\omega_{N,j}^{(k)}(t)$ is $f_j^{(k)}(t)$, for any j .

The final step is to realize that this convergence does imply that for the coefficients $W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t)$, namely what is established by Theorem 6.1.

First of all, we observe that, for any test function u we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(u, W_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)\right) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} dz_1 W_{N,1}^{(k)}(z_1; t) u(z_1) = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N W_N^{(k)}(Z_N; t) u(z_1) = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N W_N^{(k)}(Z_N; t) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N u(z_l) = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}} dZ_N W_N^{(k)}(Z_N; t) (u, \mu_N) = \left(u, \omega_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.49}$$

where we made use of the symmetry of the coefficient $W_N^{(k)}(Z_N; t)$ with respect to any permutation of the variables (the computation is the same we did in Section 5 for $W_{N,1}^{(1)}(t)$). From (7.49), we can see that $W_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)$ and $\omega_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)$ are equal as distributions in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ (in particular, we can choose test functions belonging to $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$), then the convergence of $W_{N,1}^{(k)}(t)$ is proven. Moreover, for $j \geq 2$, a straightforward computation shows that, by fixing an index $\bar{j}$, we have

$$\left(u_{\bar{j}}, \omega_{N,\bar{j}}^{(k)}(t)\right) = \frac{N(N-1) \dots (N - \bar{j} + 1)}{N^{\bar{j}}} \left(u_{\bar{j}}, W_{N,\bar{j}}^{(k)}(t)\right) + \frac{C_{j < \bar{j}}}{N}, \tag{7.50}$$

where $C_{j < \bar{j}} < \infty$ provided that $\left(u_j, W_{N,j}^{(k)}(t)\right)$ is uniformly bounded for each $j < \bar{j}$. Then, to conclude the proof of Theorem 6.1, it is enough to use a recurrence argument.

APPENDIX A

Proof of Proposition 5.1

To avoid inessential notational complications, we deal with the one-dimensional case. By the Newton equations, we have:

$$\frac{\partial x_i(t)}{\partial v_r} = \delta_{ir}t + \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \partial_x F(x_i(s) - x_j(s)) \left(\frac{\partial x_i(s)}{\partial v_r} - \frac{\partial x_j(s)}{\partial v_r} \right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\frac{\partial v_i(t)}{\partial v_r} = \delta_{ir} + \int_0^t ds \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \partial_x F(x_i(s) - x_j(s)) \left(\frac{\partial x_i(s)}{\partial v_r} - \frac{\partial x_j(s)}{\partial v_r} \right), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where:

$$F = -\nabla_x \phi, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

is the force associated with the potential ϕ .

Let us analyze in detail the derivative of $x_i(t)$. From (A.1), we get:

$$\max_{\substack{i,r \\ t \leq T}} \left| \frac{\partial x_i(t)}{\partial v_r} \right| \leq C. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Inserting this estimate again in (A.1), we realize that we can obtain a better bound for $\frac{\partial v_i(t)}{\partial v_r}$ in the case $r \neq i$ (see [17]), namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial x_i(t)}{\partial v_r} \right| &\leq C \int_0^t ds(t-s) \left| \frac{\partial x_i(s)}{\partial v_r} \right| + \\ &+ C \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{1}{N} \left| \frac{\partial x_r(s)}{\partial v_r} \right| + \\ &+ C \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{j \neq i \\ j \neq r}}^N \partial_x F(x_i(s) - x_j(s)) \left| \frac{\partial x_j(s)}{\partial v_r} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$(\text{A.6})$$

Hence, by virtue of the Gronwall lemma, we find:

$$\max_{\substack{i \neq r \\ t \leq T}} \left| \frac{\partial x_i(t)}{\partial v_r} \right| \leq \frac{C}{N}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

By (A.2), we find that the same estimate holds for the derivative of $v_i(t)$ with respect to v_r . Analogous estimates hold for the derivatives with respect to the initial positions (see also [17]). Therefore the claim of Proposition 5.1 is proven for derivatives of order one.

Now, let us consider a sequence $I := (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ of possibly repeated indices. We show that:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{\partial^k x_i(t)}{\partial v_{j_1} \dots \partial v_{j_k}} \right| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where d_k is the number of different indices in the sequence $j_1, \dots, j_k$. We know that (A.8) is verified for $k = 1$ (it follows directly by (A.4) and (A.7)), thus we prove (A.8) by induction on k . Denoting by:

$$D(I) := \frac{\partial^k}{\partial v_{j_1} \dots \partial v_{j_k}}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

estimate (A.8) can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)x_i(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

By (A.1) we derive the following estimate for $D(I)x_i(t)$:

$$|D(I)x_i(t)| \leq \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{C}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N |D(I)(x_i(s) - x_j(s))| + M_i(t), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where the term $M_i(t)$ can be computed from (A.1) according to the Leibniz rule. Let $\mathcal{P}_n := \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ be a partition of the set I of cardinality n , with $2 \leq n \leq k$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} M_i(t) &\leq \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \sum_{n=2}^k \sum_{\mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{P}_n) \left| \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} [D(H)(x_i(s) - x_j(s))] \right| \leq \\ &\leq \int_0^t ds(t-s) \sum_{n=2}^k \sum_{\mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{P}_n) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} [D(H)(x_i(s) - x_j(s))] \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where $D(H) := \prod_{h \in H} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_h}$ and $C(\mathcal{P}_n)$ are coefficients depending on the partition $\mathcal{P}_n$ and on suitable derivatives of F . By (A.11), it follows that:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)x_i(t)| \leq \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{C}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)x_i(s)| + M(t), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $M(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N M_i(t)$ and, by (A.12), we have:

$$M(t) \leq \int_0^t ds(t-s) \sum_{n=2}^k \sum_{\mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{P}_n) \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} [D(H)(x_i(s) - x_j(s))] \right|, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

We observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left| \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} [D(H)(x_i(s) - x_j(s))] \right| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} |D(H)x_i(s)| + \\
& + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} |D(H)x_j(s)| + \\
& + \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{Q}) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |D(Q)x_i(s)| \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{J \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{Q}} |D(J)x_j(s)| \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}$ is any subpartition of $\mathcal{P}_n$ and $C(\mathcal{Q})$ are coefficients depending on $\mathcal{Q}$. We assume that the estimate (A.10) holds for any $m \leq k-1$, namely:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(M)x_i(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_m}}, \quad \text{for any } M \subset I \text{ s.t. } |M| = m \leq k-1, \tag{A.16}$$

where d_m is the number of different indices in the sequence M .

Indeed, if we consider a partition $\mathcal{P}_n$ of cardinality $n \geq 2$, we are guaranteed that $|M| \leq k-1$ for each $M \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then, by noting that:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |D(H)x_i(t)| \leq \prod_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(H)x_i(t)|, \quad \forall \text{ subpartition } \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_n, \tag{A.17}$$

we can apply the inductive hypotheses (A.16) to estimate the derivatives of $x_i(s)$ and $x_j(s)$ appearing in (A.15). Thus, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} |D(H)x_i(s)| & \leq \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(H)x_i(s)| \leq \\
& \leq \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \frac{C}{N^{d_h}} = \frac{C}{N^{\sum d_h}} \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}},
\end{aligned} \tag{A.18}$$

where d_h is the number of different indices in the sequence H and we used that $\sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} d_h \geq d_k$. In a similar way, we find

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |D(Q)x_i(s)| \leq \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \frac{C}{N^{d_q}}, \tag{A.19}$$

where d_q is the number of different indices in the sequence Q . Moreover, we have:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} |D(H)x_j(s)| \leq \prod_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \frac{C}{N^{d_h}} = \frac{C}{N^{\sum d_h}} \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{J \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{Q}} |D(J)x_j(s)| \leq \prod_{J \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \frac{C}{N^{d_j}}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where d_j is the number of different indices in the sequence J . Then, putting together (A.19) and (A.21), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{Q}) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |D(Q)x_i(s)| \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{J \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{Q}} |D(J)x_j(s)| \right) \leq \\ & \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{Q}) \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \frac{C}{N^{d_q + d_j}} \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}_n} C(\mathcal{Q}) \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \frac{C}{N^{d_k}} \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

In the end, we have just proven that each term in (A.15) is bounded by $\frac{C}{N^{d_k}}$. Therefore, by using this estimate in (A.14), we find:

$$M(t) \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

By (A.23) and (A.13), it follows that:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)x_i(t)| \leq \int_0^t ds(t-s) \frac{C}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)x_i(s)| + \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Therefore, by using the Gronwall lemma, we find:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)x_i(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

As regard to the derivatives of $v_i(t)$ with respect to some initial velocities $v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_k}$, an analogous estimate holds and the proof works in the same way. Furthermore, this strategy leads to the same estimate for the derivatives of the function $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i(t)$ with respect to some initial positions $x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_k}$.

Now, thanks to the estimate we have just proven for the derivatives of the function $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i(t)$, we are able to prove the claim of Proposition 5.1. In fact, we have:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)z_i(t)| = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \in D}}^N |D(I)z_i(t)| + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \notin D}}^N |D(I)z_i(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

where $D \subset I$ contains the different indices appearing in the sequence I . Thus, according to our previous notation, $|D| = d_k$ and we denote the elements of D by $\tilde{j}_1, \dots, \tilde{j}_{d_k}$. Then by (A.26) we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |D(I)z_i(t)| &= \frac{1}{N} |D(I)z_{\tilde{j}_1}(t)| + \dots + \frac{1}{N} |D(I)z_{\tilde{j}_{d_k}}(t)| + \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \notin D}}^N |D(I)z_i(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

which implies

$$|D(I)z_i(t)| \leq C \left(\frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{d_k} \delta_{i\tilde{j}_\ell}}{N^{d_k-1}} + \frac{1}{N^{d_k}} \right), \quad (\text{A.28})$$

or

$$|D(I)z_i(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_k^{(i)}}}, \quad (\text{A.29})$$

where $d_k^{(i)}$ is the number of different indices in the sequence I which are also different from i . $\square$

APPENDIX B

Proof of Proposition 6.1

Let $U_h(t, s)$ be the two parameters semigroup solution of the linear problem:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) U_h(t, s) \gamma_0 = (\nabla \phi * h) * \nabla_v U_h(t, s) \gamma_0, \\ U_h(s, s) \gamma_0 = \gamma_0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The solution of (B.1) is obtained by carrying the initial datum γ_0 along the characteristic flow

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = v, \\ \dot{v} = -\nabla \phi * h. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Next, we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \tilde{\gamma} = L(h) \tilde{\gamma}, \\ \tilde{\gamma}|_{t=0} = \gamma_0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

which can be reformulated in integral form:

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) = U_h(t, 0) \gamma_0 + \int_0^t ds \, U_h(t, s) [(\nabla \phi * \tilde{\gamma}(s)) \cdot \nabla_v h(s)]. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The above formula can be iterated to yield the formal solution

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}(x, v; t) = & U_h(t, 0) \gamma_0(x, v) + \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \int dx_1 \int dv_1 \dots \int dx_n \int dv_n \\ & U_h(t, t_1) [\nabla_v h(x, v; t_1) \cdot \nabla_x \phi(x - x_1)] \\ & U_h(t_1, t_2) [\nabla_{v_1} h(x_1, v_1; t_2) \cdot \nabla_{x_1} \phi(x_1 - x_2)] \\ & \dots \\ & U_h(t_{n-1}, t_n) [\nabla_{v_{n-1}} h(x_{n-1}, v_{n-1}; t_n) \cdot \nabla_{x_{n-1}} \phi(x_{n-1} - x_n)] \\ & U_h(t_n, 0) \gamma_0(x_n, v_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We remark that $U_h(t_k, t_{k+1})$ acts on the variables x_k, v_k with the convention that $(x_0, v_0) = (x, v)$ and, furthermore, U_h is multiplicative and preserves the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ norms ($p = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$). Under the assumptions of Proposition 6.1, the above series is bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ by:

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{t^n}{n!} \left(\sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \|\nabla_v h(\tau)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \right)^n \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}^n \|\gamma_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

which is converging for each t . Now, we denote by $\Sigma_h(t, s) : L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, the two parameters semigroup given by the series (B.5). Then, the solution γ to the problem (6.10) is given by:

$$\gamma(t) = \Sigma_h(t, 0) \gamma_0 + \int_0^t ds \, \Sigma_h(t, s) \Theta(s), \quad (\text{B.7})$$

and, thanks to the assumption we made on Θ and to the fact that the above series (B.5) is converging for any t , we are guaranteed that $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$.

The $\mathcal{C}^k$ regularity of $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \Sigma_h(t, 0) \gamma_0$ follows by (B.5) and the fact that $U_h(t, t_1)$ propagates the $\mathcal{C}^k$ regularity. □

Proof of Proposition 6.2

The proof consists of two steps.

Step 1):

Let γ_N be as in Proposition 6.2. Then, we show that γ_N solves the problem:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \gamma_N = L(h) \gamma_N + \Theta'_N, \\ \gamma_N|_{t=0} = \gamma_{N,0}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

with

$$\Theta'_N = \Theta_N + R_N, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

and R_N is such that:

$$R_N \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

In proving (B.10), the assumption **ii)** on γ_N is crucial.

Step 2):

By virtue of Step 1), the hypotheses we made on $\nabla_v h$ and Proposition 6.1, we find that:

$$\gamma_N(t) = \Sigma_h(t, 0) \gamma_{N,0} + \int_0^t ds \Sigma_h(t, s) \Theta'_N(s). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Then, reminding that:

- $h(t) \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any t ,
- the flow Σ_h propagates the $\mathcal{C}^k$ regularity,
- $R_N \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}$,

and by virtue of the assumptions on $\gamma_{N,0}$ and Θ_N , we can easily show that:

$$\gamma_N \rightarrow \gamma, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}, \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where

$$\gamma(t) = \Sigma_h(t, 0) \gamma_0 + \int_0^t ds \Sigma_h(t, s) \Theta(s). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Therefore, we recognize that γ solves the problem (6.10) and, by virtue of Proposition 6.1, it is uniquely determined by (B.13) and hence it is in $\mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$.

Proof of Step 1):

We have:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \gamma_N = L(h) \gamma_N + \Theta_N + L(h_N - h) \gamma_N \\ \gamma_N(x, v; t)|_{t=0} = \gamma_{N,0}(x, v), \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where

$$R_N = R_N(x, v; t) := L(h_N - h) \gamma_N. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

We want to show that $R_N \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weakly. According to the definition of the operator L , we have:

$$R_N = (\nabla_x \phi * (h_N - h)) \nabla_v \gamma_N + (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h), \quad (\text{B.16})$$

thus, we have to show that

$$(u, (\nabla_x \phi * (h_N - h)) \nabla_v \gamma_N) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \quad (\text{B.17})$$

and

$$(u, (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h)) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3). \quad (\text{B.18})$$

We show only (B.18) in detail because (B.17) will follow the same line. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} (u, (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h)) &= \int dx dv \int dy dw u(x, v) \nabla_x \phi(x - y) \gamma_N(y, w; t) \cdot \\ &\quad \nabla_v (h_N(x, v; t) - h(x, v; t)) = \\ &= - \int dx dv \int dy dw \nabla_v u(x, v) \nabla_x \phi(x - y) \gamma_N(y, w; t) \cdot \\ &\quad (h_N(x, v; t) - h(x, v; t)) = \\ &= \int dx dv \int dy dw \nabla_v u(x, v) (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N)(x, v; t) (h - h_N)(x, v; t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Setting

$$\zeta_N(x, v) := \nabla_v u(x, v) \int dy dw \nabla_x \phi(x - y) \gamma_N(y, w; t), \quad (\text{B.20})$$

we can write (B.19) as:

$$\begin{aligned} (u, (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h)) &= \int dx dv \zeta_N(x, v) (h(x, v; t) - h_N(x, v; t)) = \\ &= \int dx dv \int dx' dv' (\zeta_N(x, v) - \zeta_N(x', v')) P_N(x, v; x', v'; t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

where P_N is a coupling of h and h_N , namely a probability density in $\mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^6$ with marginals given by h and h_N . Now we observe that:

$$\nabla_{x,v} \zeta_N(x, v) := \int dy dw \nabla_{x,v} [\nabla_v u(x, v) \nabla_x \phi(x - y)] \gamma_N(y, w; t), \quad (\text{B.22})$$

and, thanks to the assumption **ii)** we made on γ_N , we know that there exists a constant $C = C(u, \phi) > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_{x,v} |\nabla_{x,v} \zeta_N(x, v)| = \|\nabla \zeta_N\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} < C < +\infty. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Therefore, coming back to (B.21), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} |(u, (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h))| &\leq \int dz \int dz' |\zeta_N(z) - \zeta_N(z')| P_N(z; z'; t) \\ &\leq \int dz \int dz' C |z - z'| P_N(z; z'; t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

where we used the standard notation $z = (x, v)$ and $z' = (x', v')$. Then, taking in (B.24) the infimum over all couplings between h and h_N , we obtain that:

$$|(u, (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h))| \leq C \mathcal{W}(h_N, h), \quad (\text{B.25})$$

where, as in Section 5, $\mathcal{W}$ denotes the Wasserstein distance. But we know that the right hand side of (B.25) goes to zero because of the assumption **i**), then we have just proven that:

$$|(u, (\nabla_x \phi * \gamma_N) \nabla_v (h_N - h))| \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3). \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Analogously, we can prove that

$$|(u, (\nabla_x \phi * (h_N - h)) \nabla_v \gamma_N)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3). \quad (\text{B.27})$$

Therefore we have just proven that R_N goes to zero in the $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weak sense and the proof of Step 1) is done.

Proof of Step 2):

Thanks to Step 1) and to the assumption on $\nabla_v h$, we know that $\gamma_N(t)$ can be written as in (B.11). Then, for any function u in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, we have that:

$$(u, \gamma_N(t)) = (u, \Sigma_h(t, 0) \gamma_{N,0}) + \int_0^t ds \ (u, \Sigma_h(t, s) \Theta'_N(s)), \quad (\text{B.28})$$

namely

$$(u, \gamma_N(t)) = ((\Sigma_h(t, 0))^* u, \gamma_{N,0}) + \int_0^t ds \ ((\Sigma_h(t, s))^* u, \Theta'_N(s)), \quad (\text{B.29})$$

where Σ_h^* is the adjoint of Σ_h . We remind that the two-parameters semigroup $\Sigma_h(t, s)$ propagates the $\mathcal{C}^k$ regularity, provided that $\nabla_v h \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. In particular, if Σ_h acts on a function u which is in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ and the function $h(t)$ is supposed to be in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any t , as it is in the assumptions of Proposition 6.2, we are clearly guaranteed that $\nabla_v h(t)$ is in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any t , and then, $u(t) := \Sigma_h(t, 0)u(x, v)$ is also in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any t . Obviously, the same holds for Σ_h^* . Thus, the functions $(\Sigma_h(t, 0))^* u$ and $(\Sigma_h(t, s))^* u$ appearing in (B.29) are in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any t . Therefore, thanks to the assumptions we made on $\gamma_{N,0}$

and Θ_N , and of what we know about R_N , we find that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((\Sigma_h(t, 0))^* u, \gamma_{N,0}) + \int_0^t ds \ ((\Sigma_h(t, s))^* u, \Theta'_N(s)) \\
& \quad \downarrow \quad N \rightarrow \infty \\
& ((\Sigma_h(t, 0))^* u, \gamma_0) + \int_0^t ds \ ((\Sigma_h(t, s))^* u, \Theta(s)) = \\
& = (u, \Sigma_h(t, 0)\gamma_0) + \int_0^t ds \ (u, \Sigma_h(t, s)\Theta(s)). \tag{B.30}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Proposition 6.1, we know that the expression (B.30) identifies properly the unique solution of the problem (6.10) in $\mathcal{C}^0(L^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R}^+)$ and Proposition 6.2 is proven. $\square$

APPENDIX C

Lemma C.1: *For each time $\tau > 0$, let us define the operator $\hat{T}_N^{(n)}(\tau)$ as follows:*

$$\hat{T}_N^{(n)}(\tau) := S_N(-\tau)\hat{T}_N^{(n)}S_N(\tau).$$

Then, for each $m \geq 0$ and for each $u \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, not depending on N , such that:

$$\textbf{i)} \left| \left(u, \hat{T}_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \dots \hat{T}_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(t) \right) \right| < C. \tag{C.1}$$

Moreover, we have:

$$\textbf{ii)} \left| \left(u, T_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(t) \right) \right| \leq \left| \left(u, \hat{T}_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \dots \hat{T}_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(t) \right) \right| + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \tag{C.2}$$

Proof:

We observe that:

$$\left(u, \hat{T}_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \dots \hat{T}_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \mu_N(t) \right) = \hat{T}_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \hat{T}_N^{(r_{m-1})}(t_{m-1}) \dots \hat{T}_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) U(Z_N(t)), \tag{C.3}$$

where:

$$U(Z_N(t)) := (u, \mu_N(t)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N u(z_\ell(t)). \tag{C.4}$$

We assume $m > 0$ being the case $m = 0$ obvious.

By using the notations:

$$S(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) := T_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \dots T_N^{(r_1)}(t_1) \quad (\text{C.5})$$

and

$$\hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) := \hat{T}_N^{(r_m)}(t_m) \dots \hat{T}_N^{(r_1)}(t_1), \quad (\text{C.6})$$

we have (see the first term in the right hand side of (7.15)):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m)U(Z_N(t)) &= \frac{C}{N^m} \sum_{j_1 \dots j_m} \sum_{l_1 \dots l_m} D_x^{r_m+1} \phi(x_{j_m}(t_m) - x_{l_m}(t_m)) \cdot D_{v_{j_m}}^{r_m+1}(t_m) \\ &\quad D_x^{r_{m-1}+1} \phi(x_{j_{m-1}}(t_{m-1}) - x_{l_{m-1}}(t_{m-1})) \cdot D_{v_{j_{m-1}}}^{r_{m-1}+1}(t_{m-1}) \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\quad D_x^{r_1+1} \phi(x_{j_1}(t_1) - x_{l_1}(t_1)) \cdot D_{v_{j_1}}^{r_1+1}(t_1) U(Z_N(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

C depending on $\mathbf{r}_m$. By setting:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{j_n}(Z_N(t_n)) &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l_n=1}^N D_x^{r_n+1} \phi(x_{j_n}(t_n) - x_{l_n}(t_n)) \\ \forall \quad n &= 1, 2, \dots, m \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

(C.7) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m)U(Z_N(t)) &= C \sum_{j_1 \dots j_m} \Phi_{j_m}(Z_N(t_m)) \cdot D_{v_{j_m}}^{r_m+1}(t_m) \\ &\quad \Phi_{j_{m-1}}(Z_N(t_{m-1})) \cdot D_{v_{j_{m-1}}}^{r_{m-1}+1}(t_{m-1}) \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\quad \Phi_{j_1}(Z_N(t_1)) \cdot D_{v_{j_1}}^{r_1+1}(t_1) U(Z_N(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

We observe that, thanks to the smoothness of the potential ϕ , Φ_{j_n} (for each n) is a uniformly bounded function of the configuration Z_N , together with its derivatives.

Performing the derivatives in (C.9), we realize that $\hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m)U(Z_N(t))$ is a linear combination of terms of the following type:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j_1 \dots j_m} \Phi_{j_m}(Z_N(t_m)) \cdot D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,1}}(t_m) \dots D_{v_{j_2}}^{a_{2,1}}(t_2) D_{v_{j_1}}^{a_{1,1}}(t_1) U(Z_N(t)) \\ &\quad D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,2}}(t_m) \dots D_{v_{j_2}}^{a_{2,2}}(t_2) \Phi_{j_1}(Z_N(t_1)) \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\quad D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,m-1}}(t_m) D_{v_{j_{m-1}}}^{a_{m-1,m-1}}(t_{m-1}) \Phi_{j_{m-2}}(Z_N(t_{m-2})) \\ &\quad D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,m}}(t_m) \Phi_{j_{m-1}}(Z_N(t_{m-1})), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

with the constraint

$$\begin{cases} a_{1,1} = r_1 + 1 \\ a_{2,1} + a_{2,2} = r_2 + 1 \\ \dots \\ a_{m,1} + a_{m,2} + \dots + a_{m,m} = r_m + 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

For a fixed sequence $a_{\ell,s}$, we have to compensate the divergence arising from the sum $\sum_{j_1 \dots j_m}$, which is $O(N^m)$, by the decay of the derivatives as given by Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2. Indeed we have:

$$\left| D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,1}}(t_m) \dots D_{v_{j_2}}^{a_{2,1}}(t_2) D_{v_{j_1}}^{a_{1,1}}(t_1) U(Z_N(t)) \right| \leq \frac{C}{N^d}, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where d is the number of different indices in the sequence $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m$ for which $a_{m,1}, \dots, a_{2,1}, a_{1,1}$ are strictly positive. Note that the fact that the derivatives are not computed at time $t = 0$ but at different times $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m$, does not change the estimate in an essential way.

An analogous estimate holds when we replace U by some Φ_{j_s} , namely

$$\left| D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,k}}(t_m) D_{v_{j_{m-1}}}^{a_{m-1,k}}(t_{m-1}) \dots D_{v_{j_k}}^{a_{k,k}}(t_k) \Phi_{j_{k-1}}(Z_N(t_{k-1})) \right| \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_{k-1}}}, \quad (\text{C.13})$$

where d_{k-1} is the number of different indices in the sequence $j_k, \dots, j_m$ which are also different from j_{k-1} and from which $a_{m,k}, \dots, a_{k,k}$ are strictly positive.

As regard to the term in the sum $\sum_{j_1 \dots j_m}$ in which all the indices are different (which is the only one of size $O(N^m)$), the constraints (C.11) together with estimates (C.12) and (C.13) ensure that the product of derivatives on the right hand side of (C.10) is bounded by $1/N^m$. Thus this term is of order one. Now for each $s = 1, \dots, m-1$ consider the $\frac{m!}{s!(m-s)!}$ terms in the sum $\sum_{j_1 \dots j_m}$ in which s indices are equal. The sum is bounded by N^{m-s} . On the other hand, the constraints (C.11) together with (C.12) and (C.13) ensure that the product of derivatives on the right hand side of (C.10) is bounded by $1/N^{m-s}$. Thus even these terms are of size one and **i)** is proven.

To prove **ii)** we observe that:

$$S(\underline{\mathbf{r}}_m, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_m) U(Z_N(t)) - \hat{S}(\underline{\mathbf{r}}_m, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_m) U(Z_N(t)) \quad (\text{C.14})$$

can be expanded as in (C.7) and (C.10). However now we have an extra derivative, arising from the definition of $R_N^{(n)}$ (see (3.20)), which yields an additional $1/N$. We omit the details of the proof which follows the same line of **i)**. $\square$

In the same way we can also prove the following

Lemma C.2: *For each $m \geq 0$, $k > 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, not depending on N , such that:*

$$|\mathcal{D}^{2k} S(\underline{\mathbf{r}}_m, \underline{\mathbf{t}}_m) U(Z_N(t))| < C. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

where $U(Z_N(t))$ is defined as in (C.4).

Proof:

First we look at the case $m > 0$. Reminding the structure of the operator $\mathcal{D}^{2k}$ (see (7.3)), we are led to consider the term $D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) U(Z_N(t))$. We remind that $D_{G,j}^{2s_j}$ is a derivation operator with respect to the variable z_j that acts as specified by (6.8). By the expansion (C.10) we readily arrive to the bound:

$$\left| D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) U(Z_N(t)) \right| \leq \frac{C}{N}. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Indeed by applying $D_{G,j}^{2s_j}$ to (C.10) either $j \notin (j_1 \dots j_m)$ so that we gain $1/N$ by the extra derivative, or $j \in (j_1 \dots j_m)$ so that we reduce the sum $\sum_{j_1 \dots j_m}$ by a factor $1/N$. More generally, by the same argument we find:

$$\left| \prod_{j \in I} D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) U(Z_N(t)) \right| \leq \frac{C}{N^n}, \quad (\text{C.17})$$

where $n = |I|$.

Finally by writing the action of the operator $\mathcal{D}^{2k}$ as in (7.35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{D}^{2k} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) U(Z_N(t)) \right| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \dots s_n \\ 1 \leq s_j \leq k \\ \sum_j s_j = k}} \frac{C}{N^n} \leq B^k \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} \frac{C^n}{N^n} \leq \\ &\leq B^k \left(1 + \frac{C}{N} \right)^N \leq C, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

B, C being positive constants not depending on N . Again $\mathcal{D}^{2k} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) U(Z_N(t))$ is the leading term of $\mathcal{D}^{2k} S(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{t}_m) U(Z_N(t))$ for the same reasons we discussed in Lemma C.1.

If $m = 0$, the estimates (C.16) and (C.17) follow directly by Proposition 5.2. Thus, even in this case, the proof is concluded by (C.18). □

The fact that the error term E_N^1 (see (7.20)) and hence E_N^2 (see (7.27)) are $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$ -weakly vanishing when $N \rightarrow \infty$ is an immediate consequence of the following

Lemma C.3: *Let $\mathbf{r}_J$ and $\mathbf{t}_J$ be defined as in Section 7, for any $J \subset I_n$ with $I_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*

For any $r \geq 0$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}^{2r} S(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t)) \mu_N(z'_2 | Z_N(t)) = \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq r} \sum_{0 \leq m \leq n} \sum_{\substack{I \subset I_n \\ |I|=m}} (\mathcal{D}^{2\ell} S(\mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{t}_I) \mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t))) (\mathcal{D}^{2(r-\ell)} S(\mathbf{r}_{I_n \setminus I}, \mathbf{t}_{I_n \setminus I}) \mu_N(z'_2 | Z_N(t))) + e_{r,N} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

where

$$e_{r,N} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty \quad \mathcal{C}_b^\infty - \text{weakly}. \quad (\text{C.20})$$

Proof:

It is enough to prove (C.19) and (C.20) replacing each streak S with the corresponding $\hat{S}$, being the difference $S - \hat{S}$ negligible in the limit.

We start by assuming $r = 0$. In that case, testing the left hand side of (C.19) against a product of two test functions u_1, u_2 , we are led to consider:

$$\hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{t}_n) U_1(Z_N(t)) U_2(Z_N(t)) \quad (\text{C.21})$$

for which we can apply the expansion (C.7).

Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma C.1 (see (C.10)), we have to consider:

$$D_{v_{j_m}}^{a_{m,1}}(t_m) \dots D_{v_{j_2}}^{a_{2,1}}(t_2) D_{v_{j_1}}^{a_{1,1}}(t_1) U_1(Z_N(t)) U_2(Z_N(t)), \quad (\text{C.22})$$

where $a_{1,1} = r_1 + 1 > 0$. Now any contribution of the form

$$D_{v_{j_1}}^\alpha(t_1) U_1(Z_N(t)) D_{v_{j_1}}^\beta(t_1) U_2(Z_N(t)), \quad (\text{C.23})$$

with $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0, \alpha + \beta = a_{1,1}$ is $O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$, therefore it is negligible in the limit. The same argument applies to $D_{v_{j_k}}^{a_{k,1}}(t_k)$ whenever $a_{k,1} > 0$. This means that each derivative appearing in $\hat{S}$ either applies to $\mu_N(z'_1 | Z_N(t))$ or to $\mu_N(z'_2 | Z_N(t))$ up to an error $e_{0,N}$ vanishing in the limit. This is exactly what (C.19) and (C.20) say for $r = 0$.

For $r > 0$ we have to apply $\mathcal{D}^{2r}$ to (C.19) (replacing S by $\hat{S}$) with $r = 0$. Clearly $\mathcal{D}^{2r} e_{0,N}$ vanishes in the limit. Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \left[\hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{t}_I) U_1(Z_N(t)) \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_{I_n \setminus I}, \mathbf{t}_{I_n \setminus I}) U_2(Z_N(t)) \right] = \\ &= \left(D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{t}_I) U_1(Z_N(t)) \right) \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_{I_n \setminus I}, \mathbf{t}_{I_n \setminus I}) U_2(Z_N(t)) + \\ &+ \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{t}_I) U_1(Z_N(t)) \left(D_{G,j}^{2s_j} \hat{S}(\mathbf{r}_{I_n \setminus I}, \mathbf{t}_{I_n \setminus I}) U_2(Z_N(t)) \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.24})$$

By simple algebraic manipulation we finally arrive to (C.19) and (C.20).

REFERENCES

- [1] Spohn, H. *Kinetic equations from Hamiltonian dynamics: Markovian limits*. Review of Modern Physics, Vol. 53, No. 3 (1980).
- [2] Hepp, K. *The classical limit for quantum mechanical correlation functions*. Commun. Math. Phys. Vol. 35 (1974).
- [3] Ginibre, J.; Velo, G. *The classical field limit of scattering theory for non-relativistic many-boson systems. I and II*. Commun. Math. Phys. Vol. 66 and 68 (1979).
- [4] Bardos, C.; Golse, F.; Mauser, N. *Weak coupling limit of the N -particle Schrödinger equation*. Methods Appl. Anal. Vol. 7 (2000).
- [5] Erdős, L.; Yau, H.-T. *Derivation of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation from a many body Coulomb system*. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. Vol. 5, No. 6 (2001).
- [6] Bardos, C.; Erdős, L.; Golse, F.; Mauser, N.; Yau, H.-T. *Derivation of the Schrödinger-Poisson equation from the quantum N -body problem*. C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser I. 334 (2002).
- [7] Rodnianski, I.; Schlein, B. *Quantum fluctuations and rate of convergence towards mean field dynamics*. Preprint arXiv 0711.3087
- [8] Erdős L.; Schlein, B. *Quantum Dynamics with Mean Field Interactions: a New Approach*. Preprint arXiv 0804.3774v1
- [9] McKean, H.P. *Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations*. Stochastic Differential Equations (Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ.) (1967).
- [10] Braun, W.; Hepp, K. *The Vlasov dynamics and its fluctuations in the $1/N$ limit of interacting classical particles*. Commun. Math. Phys. Vol. 56 (1977).
- [11] Neunzert, H. *An introduction to the nonlinear Boltzmann-Vlasov equation*. Lectures Notes Math. Vol. 1048 (C. Cercignani ed.), (1984).
- [12] Spohn, H. *On the Vlasov hierarchy*. Math. Methods Appl. Sci. Vol. 34 (1981).
- [13] Dobrushin, R.L. *Vlasov equations*. Sov. J. Funct. Anal. Vol. 13 (1979).
- [14] Hauray, M.; Jabin, P-E. *N -particles Approximation of the Vlasov Equations with Singular Potential*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. Vol. 183 (2007).
- [15] Pulvirenti, M. *Semiclassical expansion of Wigner functions*. J. Math. Physics, Vol. 47 (2006).
- [16] Narnhofer, H.; Sewell, G. *Vlasov hydrodynamics of a quantum mechanical model*. Commun. Math. Phys. Vol. 79 (1981).
- [17] Graffi, S.; Martinez, A.; Pulvirenti, M. *Mean-Field approximation of quantum systems and classical limit*. Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, Vol. 13, No. 1, 59-73 (2003).
- [18] Fröhlich, J., Graffi, S.; Schwartz, S. *Mean-field and classical limit of many-body Schrödinger dynamics for bosons*. Commun. Math. Phys. Vol. 271, 681-697 (2007).
- [19] Fröhlich, J.; Knowles, A.; Pizzo, A. *Atomism and quantization*. J. Phys. A Vol. 40, No. 12 (2007).